DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 121 857 TM 005 292

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Walder, Leopold O.; And Others |
| TITLE | Recycling the Community School ESEA Title III Evaluation. |
| INSTITUTION | Behavior Service Consultants, Inc., Greenbelt, Md. |
| SPONS AGENCY | District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation. |
| PUB DATE | Aug 75 |
| NOTE | 93p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document; Best copy available |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Classroom Observation Techniques; Community Involvement; *Community Schools; Criterion Referenced Tests; Curriculum Development; Diagnostic Teaching; Elementary Education; *Elementary Schools; Individualized Instruction; Interviews; Mathematics Curriculum; Parent Participation; Physical Facilities; *Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Science Curriculum; Student Testing; Test Results; Upper Class; Urban Schools |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Alexander Shepherd Elementary School; District of Columbia; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III |

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of the "Recycling the Community School" program at Alexander Shepherd Elementary School in Washington, D.C. was conducted. The program's major objectives were: (1) initiation of the development of a multi-modal curriculum that focuses on raising of achievement of 80 percent of students in the essential skills as measured by a criterion-referenced test; (2) examination of the existing physical facility, and development of a design, through seminars and simulated learning environments, for recycling the physical facility; (3) to insure that 50 percent of the school personnel will be in the process of using diagnoitic and prescriptive techniques; and (4) to modify the school's organizational structure to maximize parent and community involvement. Review of documents, formal and informal interviews, questionnaires, and direct observations were the main methods used to assess the correspondence between the objectives of the project cycles and its accomplishments. The findings derived from the analysis of the data point to a program that shows progress but is behind schedule in the achievement of some of its objectives. The primary reason for this seems to be delays encountered in the hiring of key personnel. The results of analyses of the data, conclusions, and recommendations to continue some of the practices while modifying others are provided in this final evaluation report. (RC)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED121857

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

# Recycling the Community School
# ESEA Title III Evaluation

Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation

Division of Research and Evaluation

August 1975

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM UD

In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS INC

133 CENTERWAY BOX 97
GREENBELT, MARYLAND 20770 • USA
TEL. (301) 474-2146
CABLE: BEHAVIOR, WASH. D.C.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

TM 005 292

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

# Recycling the Community School
# ESEA Title III Evaluation

Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation

Division of Research and Evaluation

August 1975

Recycling the Community Schools
(R.F.P. No. P.S. 7515)
N.S. Contract No. 1023-AA-NS-0-5-GA

Submitted to:
Dr. Mildred Cooper
Assistant Superintendent
Division of Planning, Research and
Evaluation
Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Prepared by:

Leopold O. Walder
Linda J. Garofalo
Marcella G. Walder

Table of Contents


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Abstract | 1 |
| II. | Purpose | 1 |
| III. | Background | 2 |
| IV. | Evaluation Design | 4 |
| V. | Evaluation Methods | 6 |
| | A. Face to Face Interview | 6 |
| | B. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire | 8 |
| | C. Direct Observation by Outside Evaluators | 10 |
| VI. | Results | 11 |
| | A. Face to Face Interview | 12 |
| | B. Face to Face Interview with Students | 15 |
| | C. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire | 16 |
| | D. Direct Observation by Outside Evaluator | 24 |
| | E. Test-Retest Agreement of the Measuring Instruments | 28 |
| | F. Validity of the Measuring Instruments | 29 |
| | G. Results by Hypotheses | 29 |
| VII. | Conclusions | 33 |
| VIII. | Recommendations | 35 |

| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| IX. | Summary | 37 |
| X. | Attachments | |
| | A. Face to Face Interview | 38 |
| | B. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire | 47 |
| | C. Community/Parent Supplement to Interview | 51 |
| | D. Teacher Supplement to Questionnaire | 53 |
| | E. Student Interview | 55 |
| XI. | Appendices | |
| | A. Shepherd School Newsletter Excerpts | 56 |
| | B. List of Staff Development Workshops | 60 |
| | C. Examples of Math/Science Lab Record Keeping | 63 |
| | D. Science Attitude Questionnaire | 64 |
| XII. | Tables | |

TABLES


| Table Number | Page | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | 65 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Interviewees Endorsing Factors as Stimuli for Proposal Writing |
| II. | 66 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Project Objectives Considered to be Achievements of the Project |
| III. | 67 | Date of Initiation of Involvement and Months of Participant Involvement |
| IV. | 68 | First, Second, and Third Choices by Parents of Stimuli for Writing the Proposal |
| V. | 69 | First, Second, and Third Choices by School Personnel of Stimuli for Writing the Proposal |
| VI. | 70 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Program Objectives as Being Closest to Realization |
| VII. | 71 | Number of Participants Endorsing Program Objectives as being Second Closest to Realization |
| VIII. | 72 | Participants Endorsing Achievements to Date |
| IX. | 73 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Parent Participants Rating Specific Program Aspects |
| X. | 74 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of School Personnel Participants Rating Specific Program Aspects |
| XI. | 75 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Events Which Have Facilitated Implementation of this Program |
| XII. | 76 | Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Events Which Have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program |
| XIII. | 77 | Comparison of Endorsements of Primary Stimuli as Given by Parent Participants During First Administration with Endorsements Given During Second and Retest Administration of the Questionnaire |

| Table Number | Page | |
|---|---|---|
| XIV. | 78 | Comparison of Endorsement of Primary Stimulus Given by School Personnel During First Administration of Questionnaire with Retest Administration |
| XV. | 79 | Comparison of Endorsements by School Personnel Participants of Objective Closest to Realization as Endorsed at the Time of First Administration with Response Given During Retest Administration. |
| XVI. | 80 | Comparison of Endorsements by Parent Participants of Objective Considered Closest to Realization as Endorsed During First Administration with Responses Given During Second and Retest Administration |
| XVII | 81 | Comparison of Endorsements by Parent Participants of Events Presenting Difficulties as Endorsed During First Administration with those Endorsed During Second and Retest Administration |
| XVIII | 82 | Comparison of Endorsements by School Personnel of Events Presenting Difficulties as Endorsed During First Administration with Those Endorsed During Retest Administration |
| XIX. | 83 | Summary of Group Percent Mastery on Fall 1974 and Spring 1975 Administration of Prescriptive Math Test |
| XX. | 84 | Summary Data for Prescriptive Math Test |
| XXI. | 85 | Comparison of Parent and School Personnel Views of What Facilitated or Interfered with Implementation of the Program |

We would like to acknowledge those persons whose assistance made possible the implementation and evaluation of this project. It is the belief in educational research and innovation held by the Superintendent of Schools, Barbara A. Sizemore, the Associate Superintendent (Office of Planning, Research and Education, OPRE) James A. Johnson, Jr., and the Assistant Superintendent, Mildred P. Cooper (OPRE) that made programs such as this a reality. We would also include the Director, Division of Federal Programs, Harris M. Taylor, the Coordinator for ESEA Title III Projects, Grace H. Davis, and the Regional Superintendent for Region II, Dorothy Johnson.

The Coordinator for Title III Project Evaluation, Lavolia W. Vails, deserves special thanks for her invaluable assistance in helping us coordinate our evaluation efforts with the project officers and personnel from the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation. June Bland also helped greatly in this area.

The Project Director, Joseph Carter, and the principal of Shepherd School, Louise M. White, provided us with much assistance and cooperation in our evaluation endeavors. The Title III Advisory Council Chairperson, Elsa Miller and the Title III Advisory Co-Chairperson, Patricia Goins, are also deserving of acknowledgement.

## I. Abstract

An evaluation of the "Recycling the Community School" Program at Alexander Shepherd School was conducted. Review of documents, formal and informal interviews, questionnaires and direct observations were the main methods by which the correspondence between the objectives of the program and its achievements was assessed. The evidence, based on findings from data analyses, points to a program which shows high correspondence between some objectives and achievements and little or no progress toward the achievement of a few of the original objectives of the program. Difficulties in staffing seem to be the major reason, for the delay initiating specific aspects of the program. Recommendations to continue the program, and to continue with some of the practices while modifying and upgrading others are provided in this final report.

## II. Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide to the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation of the D. C. Public Schools an evaluation of the "Recycling the Community School" Program. An important issue of the evaluation is the amount of correspondence between the objectives of the program and its accomplishments. A second important issue is investigation of the events or circumstances which have been influential in 1) the rate at which aspects of the program have been initiated and 2) the quality of the achievements of the program.

III. Background

The Alexander Shepherd Elementary School, located in a segment of Washington, D.C. that is immediately east of Rock Creek Park, serves an area in which the residents are renown for their interest and active participation in their community. The Shepherd School community is a racially integrated one. This is in accord with the expectations and desires of its residents, many of whom belong to Neighbors, Inc. and who have actively worked to preserve the racially and ethnically diverse atmosphere of their community. The Shepherd School community is a changing neighborhood that is feeling the effect of families who are 1) moving back from suburban areas and entering their children in the public school system, 2) entering their children in public school rather than private school as a result of economic pressures and other reasons, and 3) entering their children in private schools or moving to the suburbs in search of "better" public schools as a result of dissatisfaction with the public schools in the Shepherd School area. The community members have a history of active interest in the education of their children.

There are approximately 453 pupils enrolled at Shepherd School with a pupil-teacher ratio of 24 to 1. Many of the parents of these children are professionals, and in many cases, both parents are employed. The majority of the homes in the Shepherd School area would be priced in the $50,000-$100,000 range, and some would be priced in the $100,000 plus range. There are a few apartment buildings north of Walter Reed Hospital on Georgia Avenue that fall into the Shepherd School catchment area, but for the most part, the children who attend Shepherd School are from upper socioeconomic level homes.

The parents of Shepherd School students have, in the past, been active participants in identifying and modifying perceived problem areas or issues in the school. With the hiring of a new principal in July 1973, an exploration of the strengths and weaknesses of the Shepherd curriculum was jointly undertaken by the Principal and a group of concerned parents. One area that was selected for attention was the science and math curriculum. This was stimulated by the fact that children at Shepherd had tested below the national average on nationally normed standardized achievement tests in these basic skills. The need for looking at the possibility of incorporation of a seventh grade into the Shepherd program was stressed by some members of this investigatory body. A feasibility study for a seventh, and eventually eighth,grade at Shepherd

was seen as desirable by some parents and school personnel. Other foci were individualization of instruction and upgrading of overall curriculum. Although there was agreement about the need for change in these areas, there was different ordering of priorities ities among the school and community members. A proposal-writing group, composed of parents, administrators, and teachers, was formed in the Fall of 1973. A proposal was developed and submitted in the Spring of 1974. The proposal was to develop and implement a program which addressed itself to many of the areas identified as needing attention. Among them were the math and science curricula, community-school liaison, development of an individualized instructional program, and explorations of the feasibility of adding 7th and 8th grade curricula to Shepherd School.

The program was funded in early Summer, 1974. Its major objectives are:

1) initiation of the development of a multi-modal curriculum that focuses on raising of achievement of 80% of students in the essential skills as measured by a criterion reference test

2) examination of the existing physical facility, and development of a design, through seminars and simulated learning environments, for recycling the physical faculty.

3) to insure that fifty-percent of the Shepherd School personnel will be in the process of using diagnostic and prescriptive techniques.

4) to modify the school's organizational structure to maximize parent and community involvement

It is relevant to bear in mind the fact that this project is not the only ongoing project from the D. C. Schools Research and Evaluation division. A Title VII project which focused on providing remedial work in math and reading was also in effect during the 1974-75 school year. The existence of additional programs that are in effect concomitanity with the "Recycling the Community School" program make it difficult to attribute changes in behavior to any one causal factor or specific program.

IV. Evaluation Design

The evaluation design includes the development of hypotheses to be tested, the selection of the variables to be measured, determination of the quality of measurement, locating the sources of relevant data, processing of these data to obtain findings, and presenting the findings, conclusions, and recommendations relevant to the evaluation of the program.

The bases for the development of the hypotheses to be examined and the selection of the variables to be measured came from several sources. One source was the description of the program provided to us by the personnel of the D. C. Public Schools. Another important source was discussions with the participants (students, teachers, administrators, parents, and other people in the community) in the project. Other sources of hypotheses came from suggestions available to the evaluators from their readings about and discussions concerning development of individualized curricula and community-based schools.

Each of the hypotheses may be examined by studying corresponding variables which are assessed by the use of questions designed to focus on a specific hypothesis. The hypotheses, with examples of questions used in either the face to face interview or the paper and pencil questionnaire, are presented below:

Hypothesis I

There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" that will result in modification of the school's organizational structure in order to maximize parent and community involvement.

Relevant Variables: Characteristics of the project, as measured by questions from the face to face interview and the paper and pencil questionnaire. (See Attachments A and B.) Examples of these questions are:

Question 23a. Have you [school personnel] interacted with community members as a result of involvement with this project?

Question 12. Are volunteers from the community used in the instructional and noninstructional components of the curriculum?

Question 13. What role have community members played in the development and implementation of the program?

Hypothesis II

There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" which will result in initiation of the development of a multi-modal curriculum that will focus on raising the achievement of 80% of the students in math and science skills as measured by criterion reference tests.

Relevant variable: Characteristics of the program geared toward development such as curriculum, as measured by questions from the face to face interview and the paper and pencil questionnaire. (See Attachments A and B.) Examples of these questions are:

Question 19. Has the pilot program in math/science been developed?

Question 28. In what way do you see the Pilot Math/Science Program as tying in with the overall projected curriculum development plan described in the proposal?

Test scores (from both criterion reference tests and standardized nationally normed achievement tests) for Fall 1974 and Spring 1975 were reviewed.

Hypothesis III

There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" that will result in 50% of the Shepherd School personnel using diagnostic and prescriptive techniques by the end of the 1974-1975 school year.

Relevant variable: Characteristics of the program, as measured by questions from the face to face interview and the paper and pencil questionnaire. (See Attachments A and B.) For example:

Question 20. How have the activities in the math/science lab helped you to individualize instruction for your students?

Question 22. What kinds of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques have you used during the past school year?

Hypothesis IV

There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" which will result in examination of the existing physical facility and initiation, through seminars, etc., of development of a design for recycling the existing physical facility.

Relevant variable: Characteristics of the program, as measured by questions from the face to face interview and paper and pencil questionnaire. (See Attachments A and B.) For example:

Question 21. Have any physical modifications of the existing facility occurred to date?

Question 16. Have there been any changes in the utilization of classroom space since this project started?

Hypothesis V

There are certain events and circumstances which could facilitate progress or present difficultics in effecting the rate and how well the project objectives are accomplished.

Relevant variable: Events or circumstances, as measured by questions from the face to face interview and the paper and pencil questionnaire. (See Attachments A and B.) For example:

Question 11. What events, circumstances, or people have facilitated implementations of this program?
Question 12. What events, circumstances, or people have presented difficulties in implementing this program?

## V. Evaluation Methods

Several methods were used to evaluate the "Recycling the Community School" program: 1) some of the participants were questioned by means of formal and informal individual interviews; 2) some of the participants responded to a paper and pencil questionnaire; 3) observations were made of interactions between students and teachers, of the materials and equipment in the math/science lab, and of meetings of various faculty and community groups; and 4) observations of test scores and materials from criterion reference tests and standardized nationally normed achievement tests were made.

### Measuring Instruments

The measuring instruments used in this evaluation were: 1) face to face interview, 2) paper and pencil questionnaire, and 3) direct observations. A discussion of each, including description, purpose and administration procedure, is provided below. Copies of the face to face interview, paper and pencil questionnaire, parent and teacher supplements to the questionnaire and student interview form are appended in this report as Attachments A,B,C,D,E respectively.

### A. Face to Face Interview

#### 1. Purpose

The face to face interview served as the basis for the development of a comprehensive paper and pencil questionnaire. It enabled us to obtain more detailed information about various aspects of the program.

The student face to face interview enabled us to obtain information about the effect of the program on the students and how they view specific aspects of the program.

2. Development

The face to face interview was developed on the basis of a) information about program objectives contained in the description of the program given to us by D.C. Schools personnel, b) the hypotheses to be examined, c) initial interviews with participants which were conducted during the early stages of the current follow-up evaluation, d) observations of the facilities and of participants interaction and e) earlier versions of the interview which were used to develop the final version of the face to face interview.

The student face to face interview was develop on the basis of the sources listed above as well as observations of student-teacher interactions and materials in the math/science lab.

3. Description

The formal face to face interview contains questions which deal with 1) various characteristics of the program, such as modifications in the physical facilities, staff development, development of a pilot program in math and science, individualization of instruction, community involvement and 2) the participant's interactions with each other and with equipment and materials. A copy of the standard face to face interview is included as Attachment A in the Attachment Section of this Report. Participants who were interviewed by means of the formal interview were asked to respond to all of the questions contained in the interview. Participants who were interviewed informally were asked to respond to selected questions, which were often presented in different format or sequence. However, the questions were similar in that they were related to characteristics of the program.

4. Procedure

The majority of participants who were given the face to face interview were interviewed individually. The setting of the interviews varied, with interviews conducted in administrators' offices, classrooms, the library, and community members' homes. Interview time varied from twenty-five minutes to one and one half hours, depending on speed and fullness of responding. Interview time for student interviews ranged from three to ten minutes.

Most interviews were conducted by one interviewer, although in one case two evaluators served as co-interviewers. In several other instances, one or two co-evaluators were present during an interview; however, they made minimal verbal input and spent the interview period taking notes. Notes were taken of all interviews. An audio tape recorder was used during some of the face to face interviews with parents and teachers, but only after permission was granted by the interviewee. (We started the recorder, if permission had been granted, only after the participant had given his/her name. This was designed to avoid recording any interviewee's name.) We explained that the recorder would be turned off at any time upon the request of the participant. We did not receive any such requests once initial permission to tape had been granted; however, several interviewees, at the beginning of the interview, stated that they would perfer not to be taped. These requests were honored, and the interviews were not recorded.

We chose to try to obtain such recordings in order to assist us in the evaluation of our questions Several revisions of the questions included in the interview were made, with the participants' responses and/or suggestions serving as aids in the revision process. The recordings also helped facilitate processing of some of the information obtained during the interview.

5. Scoring

The responses received to the questions were coded in such a way as to facilitate analysis Each question and response coding was categorized according to the empirical a priori hypotheses, and will be analyzed accordingly. As unexpected responses were noted, appropriate analyses to any a postiori serendipitous hypotheses were devised.

B. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire

1. Purpose

The paper and pencil questionnaire was developed as a measuring instrument that would make the retrieval of relevant information from a large number of participants manageable. It provided us with a reliability measure by allowing us to obtain two sets of responses for a selected sample of participants.

2. Development

The paper and pencil questionnaire was developed based on several sources: a) information about the project's objectives contained in a description of the program, b) hypotheses to be examined, c) information obtained during face to face interviews, and d) earlier versions of the questionnaire used during the current evaluation.

The use of the paper and pencil questionnaire and the face to face interview as coordinated measuring instruments facilitated gathering both similar and different types of data. Therefore the paper and pencil questionnaire was built upon the face to face interview. An initial version of this questionnaire was administered to a small sample of participants. It contained both untested questions and questions which had already been tested in face to face interviews. Based upon feedback from the respondents, the questionnaire was revised and refined. This process was repeated during several testing phases before a final questionnaire was developed.

3. Description

The paper and pencil questionnaire contains open-ended, multiple choice, and checklist types of questions. The questions deal with a) various characteristics of the program, such as modifications of the physical facilties, staff development, development of a pilot program in math and science, individualization of instruction, community involvement, and the participants' interactions with each other and with equipment and materials. Attachment B is the revised paper and pencil questionnaire which was administered to the majority of the participants. Attachment C is the community supplement to the paper and pencil questionnaire; it was appended to questionnaires administered to some parent participants. Attachment B is the teacher supplement which was appended to the questionnaires administered to members of the Shepherd faculty.

4. Procedure

The unrevised questionnaire was administered to two members of the teaching faculty of Shepherd School and to one community member. The time required to complete this questionnaire varied from 10 minutes to 45 minutes, the longer time period a result of a participant concomitantly responding to the questionnaire and attending to her class. Based on responses to the questions and feedback concerning the questions, the questionnaire was revised. Specific questions were added, deleted, or reworded, and the format of the questionnaire was restructured.

The final version of the questionnaire was administered to groups which ranged from 2 to 33 participants. One participant was administered the questionnaire on an individual basis. The questionnaire was administered to 12 parents, all of whom are members of Shepherd School's Title III Advisory Council. The setting for the administration of the questionnaires to parents was the home of one of the Advisory Council members, the questionnaire being administered prior to the regularly scheduled meeting. Questionnaires were mailed to 33 members of the teaching and administrative staff. The participants were requested to respond to the questionnaire and return it in the stamped pre-addressed envelope provided for that purpose.

5. Scoring

Pre-coded response alternatives were provided for some of the questions. The responses received to open-ended questions were coded in such a way as to facilitate processing. Each question and response was categorized according to the empirical a priori hypotheses, and was analyzed accordingly.

## C. Direct Observation

### 1. Purpose

Direct observations enabled us to gain first hand knowledge of many of the aspects of the program listed in the description of the program and discussed during interviews with participants.

### 2. Development

Prior to and during all site visits we tried to acquaint ourselves as much as possible with the various aspects of the program. Initial observations of the school facility and of participants' interactions during both school activities and community meetings enabled us to develop a list of variables relevant to our observations.

### 3. Description

Some of the aspects of the program we considered relevant to our evaluation efforts were:

I. Physical Facility
   - A. Modifications in existing classrooms
   - B. Use of space
   - C. Development of Math/Science Lab

II. Curriculum Development
   - A. Math/Science pilot curriculum
   - B. Materials for individualizing instruction
     1. Test materials and scores
     2. Prescriptions

III. Participants' Interactions
   - A. Administrators with other faculty members
   - B. Title III personnel with regular school personnel
   - C. Parent with school personnel
   - D. Parent with parent
   - E. School personnel with students
   - F. Students with students

### 4. Procedure

The evaluators, either individually or with one or more co-evaluators, visited the math/science lab, classrooms, the library, and other areas of the school, as well as the homes of community members, in order to make observations of events and activities considered relevant to the evaluation of the program. We observed the files in order to look at criterion reference test scores, and standardized nationally normed achievement test scores.

The evaluators used discretion in the observation activities so that their presence disrupted what was going on as little as possible. Notes were taken at the time of the observation.

Several methods of observation were used. The primary method was to go into a facility to make general observation of all activities and materials; the evaluator would take notes on all that she/he would observe during the observation period. In each case the observer had specific questions to be answered. In addition, observations relevant to other questions were also made.

5. Scoring

Observations were scored according to the existence and frequency of interactions, material, etc. Specific behaviors, as well as the presence or absence of appropriate interactions, procedures, and materials were also considered.

VI. Results

Introductory Remarks

We shall first make some introductory remarks about the results and then present the results relevant to each data gathering procedure. We shall present and discuss the relevance of the results to each hypothesis.

Both formal and informal face to face interviews were conducted with at least two members of each participant group, that is, administrators, teachers, parents, and students. In most cases, interviews were conducted with more than two members of each group. The broad range of information and feedback obtained from these interviews enabled us to develop, test, and refine a paper and pencil questionnaire which was then administered or sent to all available school personnel and a sample of the parent population.

Seven parents (representing grades K through 6) of Shepherd students were interviewed by telephone. Eight site visits were made to the school, and seven visits to homes of parents of Shepherd students. These were opportunities to interview participants, look at aspects of the program that had been implemented, administer questionnaires, and see in action some of the issues we had talked about in interviews.

The findings obtained from the measuring instruments indicate that the program is progressing, but that program achievements do not yet parallel program objectives. Delay in initiation of some aspects of the program seemed to be a direct result of the difficulties encountered with staffing. The disparity between the timing for staffing as outlined in the proposal and the actual dates of hiring project personnel has had an effect on program activities.

A. Face to Face Interview

Five formal and seven informal face to face interviews were held with community participants. Seven formal and three informal face to face interviews were held with school personnel. Nine formal face to face interviews were held with students from the 5th-6th grade.

These interviews provided us with a wide range of ideas and information about the participants, the program, and plans and hopes for the program. Such information was useful to us since it helped increase our understanding and knowledge about the program and also enabled us to include certain relevant ideas and issues in a paper and pencil questionnaire.

All of the participants appeared quite willing to speak frankly about their participation in, and feelings, thoughts, and ideas about the project. It became evident that there were several issues that were emphasized by both school personnel and parent participants as being extremely relevant to an understanding of the project.

Tables I and II* present some findings from analysis of the data from face to face interviews. Many of the participants expressed differing opinions as to why the proposal writing had been initiated. All of the parents interviewed by means of the formal questionnaire reported that a major reason for initiation of the proposal writing was to study the feasibility of incorporating a seventh grade into Shepherd School. The expansion of Shepherd School into a middle school that would allow students to continue at Shepherd School through 8th grade was viewed as desirable by the parents. Parents reported that the addition of 7th and 8th grade curricula would expand the number of alternatives available for junior high education within the public school system for students in the Shepherd School district. Forty percent of the parents also felt that the initiation of the writing of a proposal was reflective of a desire for innovation and change in the existing curriculum. One parent endorsed need for improvement in math/science skills as another reason why the proposal was written.

Table I presents the number of endorsements and percentages of interviewees endorsing factors as stimuli for the writing of the proposal. Examination of the responses of the school personnel who were interviewed by means of the formal interview show that 71% of the respondents also cited desire for a 7th grade as a stimulus for the proposal writing. However, 57% of the school personnel participants, as opposed to only 20% of the parents, felt that "need for improvement in math/science skills" was one of the primary stimuli for the initiation of proposal writing. It would seem that while both groups agreed that it was important to study the feasibility of a 7th grade, the school personnel were experiencing more concern about the need for improvement in the areas of math and science than were the parents interviewed. Such differences in initial expectations and investment in specific objectives could have resulted in differences in satisfaction with progress and achievements. (The reader may note that we conclude later that it probably did result in differences in satisfaction with progress and achievements.)

*Table I is on page 65. Table II is on page 66.

The majority of the participants are not in agreement as to the achievements to date of the "Recycling the Community School" project. Examination of Table II shows that a higher percentage of the school personnel who were interviewed gave positive endorsement to more items when they were asked to list the achievements of the project to date. Fifty-seven percent of the school personnel felt that there had been an increase in staff development opportunities as a result of the project; none of the parents who were interviewed saw increased staff development as having been accomplished. Forty-two percent of the school personnel cited that increased liaison with the community could be considered a project achievement; only twenty percent of the parents were in agreement. None of the parents felt that there had been progress toward individualization of the total school curriculum or an increase in math/science skills as a result of the project. Twenty-eight percent and 14% of the school personnel endorsed "progress made toward individualization of the total school curriculum" and "increase in math/science skills" respectively as achievements.

There are several possible explanations for the difference in opinion concerning the project's accomplishments. These differences may be thought of as stemming from two sources: 1) differences in vantage points of the participants and 2) differences that result from ratings of self as opposed to ratings of others. Different expectations at the outset may have resulted in differing degrees of satisfaction with accomplishments, since the items accomplished may have corresponded more closely to certain expectations than others. It might also be that the school personnel have more familarity with some aspects of the project since they are more likely to come in contact with and to participate in more components of the project by the nature of their position as teachers and administrators at Shepherd School. Since 40% of the parents responded that they "did not know" what had been accomplished by the project, support is lent to this hypothesis as at least a partial explanation for the difference in positive regard for project accomplishments. This also relates to the issue of involvement, since people tend to give those items which they are involved with higher ratings than items in which they have no involvement. The implication of this line of thought is that increased involvement of parent participants in the actual day to day implementation of the project objectives might result in feelings of increased satisfaction with the project's accomplishment. Reexamination of the nature of grants in general, especially the way in which tasks are assigned and power is given, is in order.

Forty-two percent of the school personnel interviews and 40% of the parent interviews felt that "implementation of a math/science program" could be considered an achievement of the program. There seems to be a sense of satisfaction with the materials, equipment, and physical organization of the math/science lab. However, several parents and classroom teachers who were interviewed felt that they did not know enough about the overall curriculum and daily activities that take place in the math/science lab.

Some feelings of concern about a lack of communication between school and community were expressed by all of the parents and three of the school personnel (42.9%) interviewed. Each group seemed to feel that the other was actively working to further the achievements of the project, but believed that increased coordination of effort and communication would result in a more productive working relationship. One example of the lack of communication and coordination which was cited by several parents and one faculty member was the issue of half-day school sessions that allowed for staff development time. Misunderstandings arose around this issue. A lack of enthusiasm or cooperation on the part of the parents that resulted from what they felt was "too short" (to allow for making arrangements to secure a baby-sitter or adjust work schedules) notice of each proposed half-day was interpreted by school personnel as a lack of support for the issue of staff development time. Both groups appeared willing to cooperate, but unclear expectations and inadequate communication processes resulted in a situation that was not at all satisfying to the participants.

Five of the seven members of the Shepherd School faculty expressed a need for increased communication and coordination between the classroom teachers and the Title III lab teachers. A suggestion was made by one of the interviewees that it would be helpful if regularly scheduled meetings were held to allow for joint planning and coordination time for the lab teachers and the classroom teachers.

One of the objectives that was addressed during the interviews with project participants was the anticipated increase in the use of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques by the members of the teaching faculty at Shepherd School. Four of the seven school personnel interviewed responded affirmatively when asked if teachers were using diagnostic techniques. Two of these four respondents elaborated by saying that both standardized and teacher-made (particularly teacher observation) techniques were in use. One teacher said that she did not know if diagnostic techniques were being used, and the remaining two faculty members interviewed did not have an opportunity to respond to the question. Most of the respondents did not give the percentage of teachers using diagnostic techniques, although two did state that there was a great deal of pressure from parents concerning the use of diagnostic techniques, which was viewed as highly desirable by many of the parents. The standardized diagnostic test that is administered at least once a year to all students was mentioned by four of the five persons who resonded to this question. One of the parents who responded to the interview reported that she was aware that the 5th-6th grade team teachers were using both diagnostic and prescriptive techniques, three of the parents said that they did not know whether diagnostic or prescriptive techniques were being used, and one participant did not have an opportunity to respond to the question.

B. Face to Face Interviews with Students

Nine students, three 6th graders and six 5th graders were interviewed in order to get feedback from the users of the lab as to what they did in the math/science lab, and how they thought and felt about the lab and their activities there. Three of the 5th graders reported having helped in getting the math/science lab started. They participated in cleaning, painting, rearranging and stocking the room.

All of the students interviewed had used the math/science lab at least once, with the majority of them reporting using it on a regular basis. One sixth grader mentioned that he had used it only for math, and one fifth grader reported using it only for science.

The responses to the questions concerning the kinds of math and science work done in the math/science lab and how it differs from the work done in the regular classroom showed that the majority of students do consider their activities in the lab to be different than in the classroom. Learning about measurement, the metric system basic skills, and math games are the kinds of math activities that students participate in while in the lab. Learning about and doing experiments with electricity and sound, learning about the solar system and living things are the kinds of science activities described by the users of the lab. The main differences between math/science lab and regular classroom activities cited were: the activity in the lab tends to be more experiential, allows concentration on one subject at a time, there is more equipment, students are allowed more input and flexibility and it is "more fun".

Each of the six students was asked if he/she liked using the lab. Two responded with a "yes", three added to the "yes" by speaking of a preference for the science activities, and one student responded in the negative.

The question "What else is different about the school this year" elicited a response of "no difference" from one child, and "no response" from four. The remaining four respondents cited the following differences "can get help in math or science", "school is better because of the lab", "the 5th-6th grade has been combined", "PTA parents care", and "language and reading are different".

The result of analyses of the student interviews show that all of the students sampled have used the lab and that most are able to discern differences between the tasks performed in the lab and in the classroom. The majority of the students clearly view their activties in the math/science lab as distinct from their math and science activities in the classroom. The majority of the students enjoy using the lab, although there seems to be preference for the science component of the lab. This fits in with the results obtained by the Project Coordinator from his analysis of the responses to the Science Attitude Questionnaire. (appended in this report as Appendix D) that he developed to measure student satisfaction with the science curriculum. The analysis of the responses given to Question 1 of this survey (How much did you enjoy science this year) show that 43% of the children who responded to the questionnaire reported liking science "very much" and 48.6% reported liking "some" during the 1974-75 school year. (Further discussion of the findings derived from analysis of data obtained from responses to the Science Attitude Questionnaire can be found in the Direct Observation results section of this report).

C. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire

The paper and pencil questionnaire was administered to 12 parents, all of whom are members of the Shepherd School Title III Advisory Council. These people responded to a questionnaire prior to one of the Advisory Council meetings. Since we administered the questionnaire only to those members who attended the meetings, we were not able to administer the paper and pencil questionnaire to all members of the Council. Therefore, our total number of parent respondents to the paper and pencil questionnaire is quite small (N=12). However, additional parent participants have been interviewed by means of face to face interviews, as mentioned in section VI A above.

Ten school personnel responded to the paper and pencil questionnaire. The questionnaire was mailed to 33 members of the Shepherd School staff in lieu of on site administration because of the difficulties (being excluded from the group meetings, etc.) encountered by the evaluators in setting up an administration time. Ten of the questionnaires were completed and returned to us, thus providing us with a total of 10 school personnel respondents.

Analysis of the data from the responses to the questionnaire are presented in Tables III through XVIII.

Table III shows the date of initiation of involvement and number of months that each of the respondents has been involved in the project. The earliest date of initial involvement of a parent respondent was October 1973: the most recent date of initial involvement was February 1975. The earliest date of initial involvement of a school personnel respondent was March 1972; the most recent date of initial involvement was March 1975.

Table IV page 68 presents the events considered by parent participants to be of first, second, and third in importance in stimulating the writing of the proposal for the "Recycling the Community School" project. "The desire for development of the 7th grade" was given 8 endorsements as the primary stimulus for the writing of the proposal; it received endorsements from 66.6% of the participants. One endorsement as primary stimulus was given to "need for improvement in math/science skills", one to "desire for development of increased communications between school and community", and one to "other" category. "The need for improvement in math/science skills "was endorsed by 49.8% of the participants as being second in importance in writing of the proposal; it was given six endorsements. The "need for an overall individualized instructional program" was given three endorsements, and both "desire for development of 7th grade", and "need for increased staff development" each received one endorsement as second in importance in stimulating the writing of the proposal. No participant endorsed "need for overall individualized instructional program" and "need for increased staff development" as being primary stimuli for the writing of the proposal. However, twenty-five percent of the participants, or three participants, considered the "need for an overall instructional program "as being second in importance. One participant endorsed "desire for development of increased communication between school and community" as being of primary importance and four participants or thirty-three percent of the respondents ranked it third in importance as a stimulus for the writing of the proposal for the project.

Table V page 69 presents the results of analysis of responses from school personnel participants who were asked to endorse events as being first, second, and third in importance is stimulating the writing of the proposal. Eighty percent of the participants endorsed "desire for development of 7th grade" as the primary stimulus. The remaining two participants, twenty percent of the respondants, endorsed "need for improvement in math science skills" as the primary stimulus. Forty percent of the school personnel participants endorsed "need for improvement in math/science skills" as being the stimulus that was second most important in stimulating the proposal writing. Thirty percent of the participants endorsed "need for overall individualized instructional program as the second most important stimulus.

Examination of these tables shows a high amount of agreement between parents and school personnel in choice of a stimuli considered to be the major stimuli for the writing of the proposal. This can be interpreted as agreement in written response among the participants at the outset as to rationale for writing a proposal to secure funding for a Shepherd School project. However, the verbal behavior of parents and teachers is different. During face to face interviews, both parents and teachers tended to complain about differences in priorties for ranking of program objectives. (A further discussion of this can be found in the preceding section on Face to Face Interview results.)

Table VI page 70 presents and compares the number of endorsements and percentage of parent and school participants endorsing program objectives as being closest to realization. The objective given the greatest number of endorsements by both parent and school personnel participants was "improvement in math/science skills", with 70% of the school personnel and 50% of the parents endorsing it as being closest to realization. "Development of an overall individualized instructional program" received the second largest number of endorsements from school personnel, with 20% of the Shepherd faculty endorsement as the objective closest to realization. Sixteen percent of the parents also felt it to be the objective closest to realization. "Increased staff development" was considered by 16.7% of the parent respondents to be the objective that was closest to realization. One parent (8.3% of the parent respondents) reported that he/she did not know which program objective was closest to realization. It can be seen that there is agreement between the parent and school personnel groups as to the endorsement of some of the objectives and non-endorsement of others as "being closest to realization". However, there are differences in the percentages of respondents endorsing specific objectives. An example of this is the percentage of participants endorsing "improvement in math/science skills", with twenty percent more of the school personnel participants endorsing it than do the parent participants. Slightly fewer parent participants endorsed "development of an overall individualized instructional program" than did school personnel. However, more parent participants endorsed "increased staff development" as the objective closest to realization than did school personnel.

Table VII page 71 presents and compares the number of endorsements and percentage of parent and school participants endorsing program objectives as being second closest to realization. Forty-one percent of the parent participants felt that "increased staff development" was second closest to realization. The receivers of the staff development training, the school personnel, did not give as many endorsements to this particular objective, since only twenty percent of the school personnel endorsed "increased staff development". There was a good amount of agreement between both groups in the area of "development of increased communication between school and community", with this objective receiving endorsement from 16.7% of the parents and 20% of the school faculty. Forty percent of the school faculty felt that "development of an overall individualized instructional program" was second closest to realization; no parent participant gave endorsement to this item. One parent felt that no objective was second closest to realization. one did not respond, and one reported that he/she did not know which objective was second closest to realization. It can be seen that different objectives were endorsed by the majority of parent participants and school personnel participants. The majority of

endorsements by parents went to "increased staff development"; the majority of endorsements by school personnel went to "development of an overall individualized instructional program".

The number of endorsements and percentage of participants endorsing program aspects as being achievements of the project to date is presented in Table VIII page 72. There is good agreement between parents and school personnel in the number of endorsements given to "individualization of instructional program" and "staff development", both of which received endorsements from twenty-percent of the school personnel felt that the "setting up of the math/science lab" could be considered an achievement of the project; eight percent of the parents felt that "community participation" was an achievement of the project. No endorsements were given by school personnel to this aspect of the program. Thirty-percent of the school personnel gave endorsements to items that were categorized as "other". They listed such items as "assembling of vast amount of material" and "communication between administration and faculty".

Tables IX and X* present the number of endorsements and percentage of parent (Table IX) and teacher (Table X) participants rating specific program aspects as to the degree of importance, amount of work done and degree of satisfaction with work done. All of the teacher participants endorsed "increase in math/science skills through use of the math/science lab" as being of high importance, while only 33.2% of the parent participants felt it to be of high importance. Forty-one percent of the parents who responded to the questionnaire ranked it of middle degree of importance. Forty percent of the teacher participants were highly satisfied with the work done to date on this aspect of the program; twenty-five percent of the parents gave endorsement to a high degree of satisfaction. Thirty-three percent of the parents endorsed "individualization of instruction through use of the math/science lab" as being of high importance, as compared to 100% of the teachers giving a similar endorsement. The majority of teacher and parent participants report only a middle-to-low degree of satisfaction with the work done on individualization of instruction.

The majority (83.0%) of the parent respondents felt that the "feasibility study for the establishment of a 7th grade" was of high or middle importance. Seventy-five percent of the parent participants felt that little or no work had been done toward achieving this objective. Examination of the ratings given by teacher participants to this same objective shows that while 50% of the teachers felt it to be of high or middle importance, 50% of the teachers felt that some work had been done in this area. Sixty-six percent of the parents report experiencing a low degree of satisfaction with the work done toward establishing the feasibilty of a 7th grade at Shepherd School; sixty percent of the teachers also feel a low degree of satisfaction with the work done.

The ratings given by parent and teacher respondents to the degree of importance of "increasing communication between school and community" were similar for "high" degree of importance, with 40% the teachers and 41% of the parents endorsing it as highly important. However, examinations of the endorsements of "middle" degree of importance, and grouping of the endorsements of "high" with "middle" shows that 100% of the teachers see increased communications as being of high or middle importance. This can be compared with the number of endorsements of "high" or "middle" given by parents. Seventy-five percent of the parent participants rate increased communication between school and community as being of high or middle importance.

* Table IX is on page 73
Table X is on page 74

Tables XI and XII* present the number of endorsements and percentage of participants endorsing events, circumstances, or people who have facilitated implementation of this program and the number of endorsements and percentage of participants endorsing events, circumstances who have presented difficulties in implementing this program. Examination of Table XI shows that 75% of the parent participants and 50% of the school personnel endorsed "participation of community members and groups" as a facilitating factor. "Participation of the Shepherd administration "was endorsed by 80% of the school personnel participants and 33% of the parent participants. Forty-percent of the school personnel felt that the "amount of communication between school personnel and community members" facilitated implementation of the program; eight percent of the parents who responded to the questionnaire agreed.

The "timing in hiring the program coordinator" was not endorsed by any parents, and received endorsement from 10% of the school personnel. Forty percent of the school personnel and twenty five percent of the parents endorsed the "sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel" as a circumstance that facilitated implementation of the program. This is not in agreement with findings from analyses of the face to face interview and direct observation data. The reports of the majority of parents and school personnel, as well as the evaluators observations point to the sequencing of hiring of the Title III personnel as a factor which did not facilitate the implementation of the program. It may be that the question format led to some understanding, in that the sequencing of hiring of personnel as a circumstance which presented difficulties in implementation of the program. Examination of the percentage of participants endorsing this alternative, as well as the alternative "timing in hiring a program coordinator, as presented in Table XII(Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Events, Circumstances, on People Who Have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program) supports this hypothesis. Sixty-six percent of the parent participants and forty percent of the school personnel participants felt that the sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel did not facilitate implementation of the program. The alternative "timing in hiring a program coordinator" received endorsements from 91% of the parents and 90% of the school personnel respondants as being a factor that contributed to difficulties in implementing the program. When one consideres that the coordinator was hired in April, approximately 5 months after the lab teachers were hired, these endorsements could be interpreted as saying that 1) participants were unhappy with the delay in hiring the coordinator, 2) participants were unhappy because they thought the coordinator was hired too soon, 3) participants were unhappy because the lab teachers were hired several months

* Table XI is on page 75
Table XII is on page 76

prior to the project coordinator. In view of results obtained from responses to other paper and pencil questions as well as interview and direct observation results, alternatives 1 and 3 appear most plausible. If these alternatives are in fact an indication of participants thoughts on this issue, then it seems unlikely that the "sequencing of hiring of personnel" for this project was condsidered to be a facilitating factor in its implementation.

Table XXI (p.85)presents a comparison of parent and school personnel views of what facilitate or interfered with implementation of the program. Examination of the table shows that there is high agreement that "timing of hiring the Program Coordinator" was a factor which interfered with the implementation of the program. There is agreement of a sort about the "amount of agreement about program objectives". Some of the parents and school personnel agreed that it was a facilitative factor and some agreed that it interfered with implementation of the program. The amount of agreement in each case is not, however, as high as that for the "timing of hiring the Program Coordinator".

Paper and pencil questionnaires were administrated to a group of parents who were not involved, to the best of the evaluators' knowledge, with the project in any capacity other than that of a parent of a student of Shepherd School. The purpose of collecting these data was to determine the familiarity with and extent of involvement in the project of the majority of the parents of Shepherd children.

The seven parents who responded to the questionnaires were randomly selected from a list of students' (and their parents') names and addresses. One parent from each student grade level was selected, and administered the questionnaire either in person or by telephone.

The findings derived from analysis of the data obtained from these interviews indicate that the majority (5 of the 7 parents interviewed) of the parents had no familiarity with the project. Four of these five parents reported that they were hearing of the project for the first time; one parent remembered reading of it in a newsletter but felt that she did not know much about the project itself. Two parents (representing the 1st and the 5th grade) reported knowing of the program. The parent whose child was in the 1st grade during the 1974-75 school year reported knowing that the project had received funding in the Fall, and that she believed that the proposal writing was stimulated by a need for an overall individualized instructional program. The parent whose child was in the 5th grade during the 1974-75 school year reported knowing of the project. However, further questioning by the interviewer revealed that she was confusing the "Recycling the Community School" program with another Shepherd program which provided remedial work in math to selected students.

It appears that only a small proportion of the parents of Shepherd children know of and are actively involved in the project. It may be that their knowledge of the project was acquired as an indirect result of participation in the Parent Teacher Organization (PTA), and that many of those parents who were active in school affairs prior to the project also became involved in the "Recycling the Community School" program.

D. Direct Observation by Outside Evaluator

Observations were made of the physical facility and functioning of the math/science lab, student-teacher interactions, teacher-administrator and lab teacher-classroom teacher interactions and Title III Advisory Council Meetings. Test scores from both criterion reference tests and standardized nationally normed achievement tests were examined. Examples of forms used for individualizing in the Math/Science Lab were obtained.

In general our findings derived from our direct observations showed a program that was delayed in starting, but that showed promise of continued progress. These findings are similar to those obtained through face to face interviews and paper and pencil questionnaires. We shall now discuss the findings derived from out observations.

The aspect of the program that seemed to be most developed was the Math/Science Lab. We observed that functioning of the lab as well as its physical layout, materials, and equipment. We saw a large, brightly decorated room, with science and math displays and equipment arranged around the perimeter and a circular arrangement of desks and work areas at one end. The other end seemed to be used for a teacher preparation area and a storage area for equipment. Among the work stations were a skills work station which incorporated the use of a digital calculator and science stations with microscopes and fish tanks. Although we did not have an opportunity to observe any of the children working individually with these stations, we did observe several groups of children as they participated in lessons in liquid measurement, geometric shapes, and other kinds of "hands on" learning activities. During these sessions, a classroom teacher was usually present. Although the classroom teachers did not take an active role in the lesson or activity, they did participate to some extent in the form of interjection of comments, the making of suggestions and working individually with students. Schedules for the week's activities for specific groups of children were posted on the walls, and examination of them revealed differences in the types of activities and times allotted for different groups of students.

Various kinds of prescriptive and record-keeping forms seem to be in use. Examples of such forms are included as Appendix C in the Appendices Section of this report.

It is evident that progress has been made in the set-up and functioning of the lab to date. However, more work is needed to fully

systematize the operation of the lab. Additional work is needed in the area of curriculum development. The effect of the lab activities, and their coordination, with the rest of the school curriculum in the areas of math and science was not easily discernible.

We found no evidence of any work on a feasibility study for seventh and eighth grades. We found some but not much evidence of the use of community resources. This evidence is in the form of reports of contacts made with community organizations such as a Senior Citizens Organization. The delay in the hiring of the project director and the fact that a community resource coordinator was not hired seem relevant to these lacks of progress, as do some differences of opinion between parents and teachers as to program priorities.

We did not have many opportunities to observe teacher-teacher, teacher-administrator, or teacher-student interactions. As mentioned previously, we observed a few examples of Title III teachers and classroom teachers working together while in the math/science lab, but it appears that there is limited contact and little coordination of effort between lab and regular classroom teachers.

We had difficulty obtaining permission to attend faculty meetings and planning sessions. Our opportunities to observe faculty interactions at planning sessions and seminars, were therefore limited.

We attended three meetings of the Shepherd School Title III Advisory Council during which we observed the interactions of concerned parents and the project coordinator and listened to their discussions of the program and its progress. Such discussions revealed a concern on the part of the parents about their lack of information about the project, a lack of progress, and the possibility that the project would be terminated just as it was starting to progress.

We learned of the existence of a Shepherd School Newsletter, which, coupled with minutes of the Shepherd Title III Advisory Council meetings, yielded information about the beginnings of the program. Excerpts from various issues of the Newsletter and minutes of meetings were incorporated into a document that charts the progress of the project since its inception (included as Appendix A in the Appendix Section of this report).

Our observations of the Shepherd School Title III Advisory Council meetings revealed a group of concerned and action-oriented persons who were somewhat limited by the program's organizational set-up and who were frustrated by their lack of participation and decision-making power. The interactions and discussions between the parent group (members of the Advisory Council) and the school

representatives (the Project Coordinator and the Principal), which were conducted in a careful yet cooperative fashion, revealed a need for additional communication and coordination of effort between the two groups.

We obtained from the Project Coordinator a copy of a Science Attitude Questionnaire which he devised and administered to a sample of sixth grade students. This questionnaire, with accompanying summary data, is included as Appendix D in the Appendices section of this report. The administration of such a survey is a beginning point in the development of a standardized procedure for measuring achievement level in science. The use of such a measuring instrument is necessary in order to determine whether or not the project objective of raising the achievement of 80% of the students in science skills has been realized. Examination of the data, summarized by the Project Coordinator, reveals that 43% of the respondents reported liking science "very much" and 48.6% "some" during the 1974-75 school year. Specific questions (e.g., Question 15. Put a check in front of the things you are sure you can do.) deal with ability to perform various science-related skills. Examination of the items receiving the greatest number of endorsements by students reveals a report of a higher level of understanding, and may also indicate a greater degree of emphasis in the curriculum in the areas of environmental protection, knowledge of the functioning of the body, knowledge of the solar system, and ability to use the metric system of measurement and conduct scientific experiments. It is, however, important to bear in mind the fact that these results are derived from self-ratings and are not derived from an ability test.

We examined test scores from both criterion reference tests and standardized nationally normed achievement tests.

Table XIX (p.83) presents the percent mastery of Grade 1 on the behavioral objectives of the CRT* in math for Fall 1974 and Spring 1975. We examined comparable data for Grades 2, 3, 4, and 5.

From these data Table XX (p 84) was derived. It summarizes the data available on the grades 1 through 5. All the data show increases in percent mastery from Fall to Spring. As a way to assess the magnitude of these increases we calculated t tests (The statistical test used was taken from Counts, Psychological Statistics, Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1966, p. 214). If a t reaches 5% level of significance one can assert that the increase is not likely to be due to chance factors. One cannot assert from these data only that the increase is due to the Title III program. The t's reached a high level of significance in grades 1, 3, 4, and 5. There were significant differences in the Fall and Spring scores of each of these grade levels, with a higher percent of mastery occurring in the Spring.

* CRT = Criterion Reference Test

The program objective is to start a program which ultimately will increase scores for 80% of the students. Examination of Table XIX (p83)shows that 80% of the first grade students did not pass many behavioral objectives in the Spring of 1975. On the face of it, it therefore appears that this objective was not met. Two issues should be raised: (1) The CRT is so constructed and scored as to be quite insensitive to individual growth in students. If percents were reported for those passing none, one, two, or three problems for each behavioral objective in the CRT we might be able to have a better indication of improvement.

(2) The program objective asks for "initiation of development of a multi-modal curriculum which will focus on the raising of achievement level of 80% of the students". It is therefore not reasonable to expect in this first year just as the program is starting that one would get beyond the initiation, certainly not the raising 80% of scores. It is however, reasonable that there be more influence on the general math/science curriculum from the Math/Science lab. It is also reasonable that a standarized science test be administered in both Fall and Spring as is the math test.

E. Test - Retest Agreement of the Measuring Instruments

1. Paper and Pencil Questionnaire

The final version of the paper and pencil questionnaire was administered twice to subgroups of school personnel (N=2) and of parents (N=3). The N's were necessarily small to avoid overburdening too many people. These five participants were asked to respond to the questionnaire for a second time so that a measure of the test-retest agreement of the paper and pencil questionnaire could be obtained. The retest administration was separated from the main administration by a time interval of approximately four weeks. Since it is not necessary to schedule retest administrations at standard time lapse intervals from the date of the first administration in order to obtain true retest data, the retest administration dates were chosen to cause as little inconvenience as possible to the participants. A factor that the evaluators did take into considerations when scheduling the retest administration was that it would be preferable not to have the retest given after an extremely long time lapse. This was important because differences in responses as a result of changes in achievements or program emphasis would not be as probable as might be expected had several months had elapsed between the two administrations.

Since all questionnaires were taken anonymously, we cannot match questionnaire to questionnaire. We shall therefore present comparison of the responses of the school personnel retest group for specific questions with the responses of the participants in the main administration and of the parent retest group responses with the responses obtained during the main administration.

Table XIII through XVII* present a comparison of first administration and retest administration responses by parents and by school personnel for Question 8 through 12 of the paper and pencil questionnaire. Examination of the tables shows that there is fair to good agreement on specific issues among participants from one administration to the next.

2. Direct Observations

Initial observations of facilities and participant interactions were made by two or more observers at the same time and place in order to check for interjudge agreement in the observations. Discussion of the observations made revealed a high level of agreement concerning specific behaviors, equipment and materials and participant interactions. Small differences in observation reports were attributed to the non-use of a standard event sampling technique. That is, during the observation period, different observers might have been attending to slightly different interactions or materials during a specific time period. In general, the level of interjudge agreement was deemed sufficiently high to allow the observers to make further observations individually.

*Tables XIII through XVII on pages 77 through 81.

F. Validity of the Measuring Instruments

The relations among reports by the same groups of respondent means of the face to face interview and by means of the paper and pencil questionnaire and by different groups of respondents, as well as from direct observations by the staff of Behavior Service Consultants, Inc. (the outside evaluator) constitute the substance of the preceding Results Section. The findings from the analyses of the responses from the administration of the paper and pencil questionnaires are similar to findings derived from direct observations and interviews with project participants. These findings, in addition to being interrelated, are also related back to the stated objectives of the project proposal. Such interrelations are the validities or meanings of the measuring devices used here.

G. Results by Hypotheses

The quantitative study of the five hypotheses is based upon data from the face to face interviews, the paper and pencil questionnaire, and direct observations. The results of these analyses will be blended and discussed in relation to the relevant hypothesis.

Hypothesis I. There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" that will result in modification of the school's organizational structure in order to maximize parent and community involvement.

Parent and community involvement is beginning to develop. Organizations such as the Shepherd Title III Advisory Council and the Parent Teachers Association (PTA) have participated in the development and, to a lesser extent, in the implementation, of the program. Development of community resources has not been accomplished on a wide scale as yet; however, work toward the development of such resources and involvement of the Shepherd community in the project has increased since the Project Coordinator joined the staff in April 1975.

Although parent and community involvement has increased, additional emphasis is needed in this area if such involvement is to be maximized. As yet, no modification of the school's organization structure (in terms of decision-making or planning power) was discernible. The role of the parent and community groups seems to be an advisory role, and any direct effect that they have on current program activities is not easily discernible.

Hypothesis II. There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" which will result in initiation of the development of a multi-modal curriculum that will focus on raising skills.

The initiation of development of a multi-modal curriculum which will raise the scores of 80% of the children on Criterion Reference Tests (CRT) seems to have taken the form of development of a Math/Science Laboratory. The findings derived from face to face interviews with participants, paper and pencil questionnaires and direct observations indicate that while a Math/Science program has been implemented, as yet there is no systematic Math and Science Lab curricula. The work done thus far in this area, however, can be considered to be steps in the right direction toward development of such a curriculum.

It is not possible (nor reasonable when one considered that the project is in its infancy) to determine at this time whether the achievement of 80% of the students in math and science has been raised. However, the findings derived from examinations of the test results from the Math CRT scores show an increase on all grade levels from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975. This increase cannot be attributed to this math/science program. However, the analysis, of individual students Fall-Spring scores in future years can give indications of the increasing effect of such program as it develops.

Examination of the responses given to a Science Attitude Survey Test developed by the Project Coordinator yielded the information that the majority of students report that they liked the science program this year. However, there is no way of determining whether or not the science curricula will raise the skills of students in this area. There is evidence that the math/science lab stimulated a higher degree of interest on the part of students, and some teachers, in the area of science. As might be expected in a newly developing program, we found evidence of variability in utilization of and access to the science resources provided by the Math/Science lab.

Hypothesis III There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" that will result in 50% of the Shepherd School personnel using diagnostic and prescriptive techniques by the end of the 1974-75 school year.

A standardized diagnostic test in math and reading (McGraw-Hill Prescriptive Math and Prescriptive Reading Test) was administered to all students twice during the 1974-75 school year. The findings derived from analyses of paper and pencil questionnaires and face to face interviews reveal that, of the teachers sampled, 57% report that they are using diagnostic techniques. One half of these respondents report using both standardized and teacher-made diagnostic techniques.

Although we do not have evidence that individual teachers are using prescriptive techniques, it is reasonable to assume that some teachers are making use of the diagnostic information about their students to better meet individual needs. Clearly the selection of specific students (based on diagnostic test scores) for remedial and accelerated programs in the math/science lab indicates that individualization of instruction in these areas is beginning to occur. Whether this individualization of instruction through the use of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques is directed to groups of students or to individual students is not clear.

There is no evidence that the use of diagnostic or prescriptive techniques is a result of this project, or that there has been an increase in the use of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques since the initiation of the project.

It is difficult to determine the precise extent to which such techniques are used by teachers. The most efficient and valid way would be to directly observe the extent to which teachers use diagnostic or prescriptive techniques in their work. Because the project was viewed as being in its beginning phases, it did not seem appropriate to pursue a detailed observation of these techniques at this time. Questions dealing with these techniques were included in the paper and pencil questionnaire and face to face interview. They were not designed in such a way that any causal relationships between the use of such techniques and the "Recycling the Community School" could be determined.

Hypothesis IV There are certain characteristics of the program entitled "Recycling the Community School" which will result in examination of the existing physical and initiation, through seminars, etc., of development of a design for recycling the existing physical facility.

Progress in the recycling of the existing physical plant can be seen in the math/science lab and its adjoining storage room. Renovation of these areas included repainting and reorganization of furniture and equipment as well as obtaining new materials. Some changes were made in location of other class areas in order to reallocate space for the lab, but to date few physical modifications other than those directly related to the lab have occurred. An Educational Architect (who is a Shepherd parent) was consulted with respect to the selection of paint colors and arrangement of the room which would house the lab. Further discussions were held with him about the feasibility of developing a design for

recycling the physical plant, and concern was voiced about the possibility of lack of space to house a 7th and 8th grade. Other buildings in the Shepherd community were briefly mentioned as possibilities for this purpose but at the stage the project was in, there apparently was no opportunity for further exploration. Another example of a change in the physical plant that also related to the science program can be seen in the landscaping and the tree plantings that took place on the school grounds.

Hypothesis V There are certain events and circumstances which could facilitate programs or present difficulties in affecting the rate and how well the program objectives are accomplished.

The primary constraint which presented difficulties in implementation of the program activities was the delay in hiring all program personnel, particularly the Project Coordinator. This delay, as well as resultant sequencing of hiring of key personnel, has had widespread effects on the timing of many phases of the program and thus the achievement of scheduled goals.

If one takes into account the delays (which were not a result of any action or lack thereof on the part of program participants) encountered in initiating the program, the program could be viewed as being three months old at the close of the 1974-75 school year. If one considers this to be true, then the achievements to date should be viewed in a different light. One would then say that a good amount of progress has been achieved in a three month program span.

The findings from the results of analyses of paper and pencil questionnaire responses, which are supported by findings derived from interviews and direct observations, reveal that a lack of agreement among participant groups about program objectives may have had some effect on implementation of the program. However, it is clear that there is interest and desire for active participation on the part of the school personnel involved and a small group of parents.

The lack of an adequate measuring instrument for measuring the gains made by student-participants in math skills makes the program objective of raising achievement level of 80% of students in math "difficult to measure". The fact that, as yet, there is no standardized measuring instrument for science skills also presents difficulties in measuring program achievement of this objectives..

## VII. Conclusions

### Hypothesis I

Limited parent involvement is beginning to develop. This involvement seems to be restricted to the Title III Advisory Committee, many of whom have a past history of involvement as PTA members. Therefore, there is no evidence that there has been an increase, beyond a small group of parents, in parent and community involvement. This is not unlike any other organization in that from a large pool of potential participants, a relatively small number become actively involved.

This small group of parents appears to be eager to take on more responsibilities as active partners in carrying out this However, it appears that the fashion in which the grant was implemented restricted the participation of community members in any other than an advisory capacity.

There is evidence that community members were equal partners in the writing of the proposal, but apparently not in the implementation. This problem is not unique to this project, but is a problem nonetheless in programswhich seek to include school-community collaboration.

### Hypothesis II

The initiation of the development of a multi-modal curriculum which ultimately will raise the scores of 80% of the children on Criterion Reference Tests (CRT) has taken the form of the Math/Science Laboratory. Little, if any, evidence exists that this laboratory is instituting changes in the general math science curriculum. Math CRT scores show an increase from Fall 1974 to Spring 1975. This increase cannot be attributed soley to this math/science program. However, if the program continues for several more years, each set of Fall-Spring scores can give indications of the increasing effect of such a program as it develops. The method of construction and scoring of the CRT does not provide sensitive enough measurements of this effect. Additionally, the scores supplied by the test company do not use all of the sensitivity available in the test.

In the absence of a standardized science test, the Project Coordinator (who arrived only in the late Spring of 1975) attempted to develop an attitude questionnaire about satisfaction with the science program. This effort is to be commended, but it is hardly a substitute for a quality, well-developed ability test in science.

Hypothesis III

There is evidence that all teachers had available to them standardized diagnosed procedures for diagnoses of math skills, as well as evidence from self-report that the majority of teachers used teacher-made diagnostic procedures as well. This is not true of the science component of the program. No standardized test was administered.

The evidence is weaker regarding prescriptive approaches to teaching. The selection of specific students (based on diagnostic test scores) for remedial and accelterated programs in the math/science lab indicates that individualization of instruction is beginning to occur.

Hypothesis IV

Some beginning progress was made in studying and changing the physical plant. An Educational Architect was consulted, and discussions were held in regard to the feasibility of redesigning the existing space or as an alternative making use of other existing space in the community as part of the school facility. The architect was also consulted in regard to paint colors and use of space in the math/science lab.

Hypothesis V

A major issue that was brought to the attention of the evaluators had to do with the constraints which have hindered implementation of various phases of the project and have slowed down the rate at which other phases have occurred. A primary constraint was staffing delays and problems, which resulted in inability to hire the Title III teachers for the math/science lab until the middle of the first semester of funding (i.e., the Fall '74 semester) and the Program Coordinator until April of the second semester of funding (i.e., the Spring '75 semester). These delays, coupled with the sequencing of hiring of the key project personnel, have had an adverse rippling effect on both the "Recycling the Community School" project and the Shepherd School faculty and students. One result was that the Principal was faced with the additional responsibility of directing the project for a major part of a school year. The "Recycling the Community School" project is of sufficient scope that a full-time coordinator was necessary from the outset if coordination of efforts of all the participants and meeting of program schedules was to be achieved. The fact that the project never progressed to the point that the Community Resource Coordinator was hired limited the extent to which information about the project was disseminated to parents and the general community.

VIII. Recommendations

1. The project should be permitted to continue. In view of the difficulties this project had in getting started, it has not had sufficient time yet to become well developed.

2. We recommend in the implementation of programs that there be a sequence interlock such that event B occurs only after A has occured. For example, in this project, the hiring of the project coordinator should precede all other hirings. Because of the lack of a sequence interlock, other events took place out of sequence, or did not take place, during the 7 months that the project was without a coordinator. The project may have been in better shape if it had been delayed a full school year, which would allow for proper sequencing of program activities, than it is after being delayed 7 months. We feel that the lack of a sequence interlock has handicapped the program in terms of what it possibly might have achieved.

3. Personnel practices, expecially those involving the hiring of personnel for positions in innocative programs, should be streamlined. Otherwise good programs can be delayed and thus made less good.

4. A proposal should place emphasis on building into the project adequate evaluation and measuring techniques. For example, baseline tests given the year before the program starts, or at the beginning of the project, would make it possible to determine whether change has occurred during the life of the program.

5. We urge the continuation of the excellent program of testing in the fall and spring. Criterion Reference Tests provide an excellent format because very specific diagnostic information gained from these tests lead directly to prescriptive recommendations. We urge the school system to buy this service on a regular basis. This would enhance the diagnostic and prescriptive activities of the school.

6. The test used to measure math skills contains more information than is reported, for example with a set of three problems we now know only that a student solved three out of three problems. (That is he passed, or that he solved fewer than three - that is, he failed.) Thus a student who improved by showing an increase of from zero solved 1 solved, would not be counted as having improved with the current scoring system. We recommend that individual change scores be obtained and made availabe to the teaching faculty.

7. It is important that a criterion reference test in science becomes available to supplement the existing testing program.

8. We recommend against making as program objectives predictions such as, for example "80% are going to improve". Unless teaching and testing programs are adequately individualized ceiling effect interfere with and/or mask improvements that could take place but don't, or did take place and are not measured.

9. More community input should occur. Involvement needs to be extended beyond a small group of interested parents to the Shepherd community at large. The hiring of a community co-ordinator would facilitate this process.

10. The amount of communication and coordination between parent groups and school personnel should be increased. The appointment of representatives from each group who would serve as representatives to the other groups is seen as desirable.

11. The amount of communication and coordination between the Title III teachers and the regular teaching faculty should be increased. Regularly scheduled meetings would provide an opportunity for exchange of information, planning and coordination.

## IX. Summary

An evaluation of the "Recycling the Community School" program at Alexander Shepherd School has been conducted. Review of documents, formal and informal interviews, questionnaires and direct observations were the main methods used to assess the correspondence between the objectives of the project cycles and its accomplishments.

Nine members of the administrative and teaching faculty at Shepherd and five community members were interviewed. A paper and pencil questionnaire was administered to twelve parents and four teachers, and mailed to 33 members of the Shepherd School staff. Various school personnel and community members were interviewed by means of an informal interview. Direct observerations were made both in the school and in the community. The findings derived from the analysis of the data point to a program that shows progress but is behind schedule in the achievement of some of its objectives. The primary reason for this seems to be delays encountered in the hiring of key personnel. The results of analyses of the data, conclusions, and recommendations to continue some of the practices while modifying others are provided in this final evaluation report.

X . Attachment A - Face to Face Interview

Project: Shepherd School Date:

Contact #: Staff:

Starting Time:

Ending Time:

Face to Face Interview

1. What stimulated the writing of the proposal for the Shepherd project?

_____ desire for a 7th grade

_____ need for a community school

_____ need for an overall individualized instructional program

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

2. Who was involved in the proposal writing?

_____ principal

_____ teachers

_____ PTA members

_____ non-parent community members

_____ consultants

_____ students

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

3. A program schedule was outlined in the proposal. Has it proved to be realistic?

_____ yes

_____ no

4. If no, in what ways has it been revised?

_____ activities have changed; time schedule changed

_____ activities same; time schedule changed

_____ time schedule same; activities changed

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

5. At the outset of the project, what do you see as the main objectives of the program entitled Recycling the Community School?

_____ individualization of total school curriculum

_____ development of community middle school

_____ development of K through 7 curriculum

_____ development of liaison with community

_____ staff development

_____ other (specifiy) _____

_____

_____

6. What objectives of the project, in your opinion, have been achieved?

_____ individualization of total school curriculum

_____ development of community middle school

_____ development of K through 7 curriculum

_____ development of liaison with community

_____ staff development

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

7. At the present time, where do you think the project is with regard to achieving its objectives?

_____ well on its way

_____ coming along

_____ just getting started

_____ no progress

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

8. What do you see your pressures problems to be with regard to this project?

_____ bureaucratic "red tape"

_____ money is insufficient

_____ need more support from community

_____ need to have time extension

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

9. What do you see as your role in the Recycling the Community School Project?

_____

_____

10. What role have community members played in the development and implementation of the program?

_____ assisted in the proposal writing

_____ formed a Citizens Advisory Council

_____ helped with the remodeling of the room for the pilot Math/Science program

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

11. What kinds of steps have been taken to facilitate interactions and communications between school personnel and community members?

_____ slot for community resource coordinator

_____ Citizens Advisory Council

_____ PTA

_____ newsletters

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

12. What plans are there for individualizing instruction?

_____ diagnostic testing

_____ grouping by need level

_____ accelerated programs

_____ individualized prescriptions

_____ remedial programs

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

_____

13. Are teachers using diagnostic techniques?

_____ no

_____ yes What percentage of teachers are? _____

If yes, are they _____ standardized

_____ teacher-made

Are teachers using prescriptive techniques? _____ yes _____ no

What percentage of teachers are? _____

14. The proposal mentions criterion reference test scores - have such scores been obtained?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes, When are the children tested?

_____ at the beginning of school year

_____ at end of school year

_____ at beginning and end of school year

_____ at irregular times

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

15. What do you view as essential skills to be tested?

_____ math

_____ reading

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

Tests used _____

16. Has there been any staff training sessions since the writing of the proposal?

_____ no

_____ yes

17. If yes, When were they started?

_____ beginning of grant (date _____)

_____ after fall 1974 term ended

_____ just recently (specify when) _____

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

18. How often do they occur?

_____ weekly

_____ monthly

_____ irregular times

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

19. Who receives this training?

_____ all staff

_____ administrators

_____ Title III teachers

_____ parents

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

20. What areas have been dealt with during staff training?

_____

_____

_____

21. Have any physical modifications of the existing facility occurred to date?

_____ no If no, have any changes been planned? _____

_____ yes If yes, specify what has already occurred and when it happened. _____

_____

If yes, what else is planned? _____

_____

_____

Have there been any changes in the utilization of classroom space since this project started? _____

_____

_____

22. Who took part in the remodeling?

_____ parents

_____ teachers

_____ students

_____ administrators

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

23. Has any kind of consultation with outside architecture firms occurred to date?

_____ no If no, when planned? _____

_____ yes

_____ don't know

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

24. Has the pilot program in Math/Science been developed?

_____ no If no, when planned for? _____

_____ yes If yes, please describe. _____

_____

_____ partially

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

25. Who was involved in its planning?

_____ teachers

_____ program coordinator

_____ principal

_____ community members

_____ students

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

26. How are students selected for participation in this Math/Science pilot program?

_____ on the basis of test scores

_____ by homeroom teachers

_____ by the Title III teachers

_____ by conference between homeroom teachers and Title III teachers

_____ other (specify) _____

_____

27. What kinds of activities are taking place in the Pilot Math/Science room?

_____

_____

_____

_____

28. In what way do you see this Pilot Math/Science Program as typing in with the overall projected Curriculum Development Plan described in the proposal?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Define a multi-model curricula, and describe the Shepherd plan.

_____

_____

_____

_____

29. A. What was the organizational structure at Shepherd School before this project started? _____

_____

_____

_____

29. B. What is the organizational structure at present? (What are the roles of parents and community?) _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. Can you think of anything else I should be asking about the "Recycling the Community School" project here at Shepherd?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Attachment B - Paper and Pencil Questionnaire

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS | BSC
BOX 186 • GREENBELT, MARYLAND 20770 • USA

Dear Participant in the Shepherd School Title III Project:

Below are questions about the "Recycling the Community School" project. Please use this opportunity to give us feedback about this project. Feel free to write answers in addition to or instead of any of the response choices provided by us. Thank you for your help.

Behavior Service Consultants
Title III Outside Evaluators

Date: _____ 1. Sex 2. (3, 4) Age _____

(1) _____ Male
(2) _____ Female

3. (5, 6) Occupation _____

4. Role

(7) _____ Teacher (specify grade level[s]) _____
(8) _____ Parent (specify grade level[s] of child or children) _____
(9) _____ Administrator (specify position) _____
(10) _____ Other (specify) _____

5. How long have you lived in the Shepherd School District? (11, 12) _____ year(s)

6. When did you first become involved with Shepherd School?

(13, 14) _____ Month (15, 16) _____ Year

7. When did you first become involved with the "Recycling the Community School" project?

(17, 18) _____ Month (19, 20) _____ Year

(Please check each of the appropriate blanks in the following questions. Multiple response permitted. Please rank order your answers in order of importance.)

8. What stimulated the writing of the proposal for the "Recycling the Community School" project? (Please write "1" for most important, "2" for next, etc.)

(21) _____ Desire for development of 7th grade
(22) _____ Need for an overall individualized instructional program
(23) _____ Need for improvement in math/science skills
(24) _____ Desire for development of increased communication between school and community
(25) _____ Need for increased staff development
(26) _____ Other (please specify) _____

9. Which objective in Question No. 8 is closest to being realized? (27) _____

10. Which is next closest? (28) _____

11. What events, circumstances, or people have facilitated implementation of this program? (multiple response permitted)

(29) _____ Participation of community members and groups

(30) _____ Timing in hiring the program coordinator

(31) _____ Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator)

(32) _____ Amount of communication between school personnel and community members

(33) _____ Timing in hiring a community resource coordinator

(34) _____ Amount of agreement about program objectives

(35) _____ Participation of the Shepherd administration

(36) _____ Participation of the Shepherd faculty

(37) _____ Other (please specify) _____

12. What events, circumstances, or people have presented difficulties in implementing this program? (multiple response permitted)

(38) _____ Participation of community members and groups

(39) _____ Timing in hiring program coordinator

(40) _____ Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator)

(41) _____ Amount of communication between school personnel and community members

(42) _____ Timing in hiring a community resource coordinator

(43) _____ Amount of agreement about program objectives

(44) _____ Participation of the Shepherd administration

(45) _____ Participation of the Shepherd faculty

(46) _____ Other (please specify) _____

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS! BSC

13. Here is a list of some aspects of the Title III Project. Please check the blanks that most closely reflect your viewpoint concerning each aspect listed.

| Program Aspect | Degree of Importance | | | Amount of Work Done | | | | Degree of Satisfaction with Work Done | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (47) (48) (49) | High | Middle | Low | Much | Some | Little | None | High | Middle | Low |
| To increase Math/Science Skills through use of the Math/Science Lab. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (50) (51) (52) Individualization of instruction through use of Math/Science Lab. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (53) (54) (55) Feasibility study for the establishment of the 7th grade | | | | | | | | | | |
| (56) (57) (58) Community involvement through the development of a Community Advisory Council for Community input. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (59) (60) (61) Staff development (in areas of math, science and human relations) | | | | | | | | | | |
| (62) (63) (64) Increased communication between school and community | | | | | | | | | | |

14. Please list what you see as the achievements of this project to date. (Please rank order your answers in order of importance.)

15. What is yet to be achieved by this project? (Please rank order your answers in order of importance.)

16. What do you see as the next steps to further this project?

17. Please note your personal involvement in this project.

18. Any additional comments about the project?

BEHAVIOR SERVICE CONSULTANTS! BSC

Attachment C - Community/Parent Supplement to the Face to Face Interview

COMMUNITY/PARENTS

1. What has been your personal involvement in this program? _____

2. What do you see as the goals of this program? _____

3. Have you been able to accomplish what you set out to do? _____

4. What changes in the Shepherd Community do you see as a result of this program? _____

5. A. What has the program accomplished so far? _____

   B. What is left to be done? _____

   C. What are the problems? _____

6. What do you see as the role of a community resource coordinator (teacher)? _____

COMMUNITY/PARENTS (Contd.)

7. Is there anything else I should be asking about parent or community involvement in the Shepherd program? _____

_____

_____

19. What training have you and your class received to help you utilize the resources of the math/science lab?

20. How have the activities in the math/science lab helped you to individualize instruction for your students?

21. What steps have been taken to integrate the math/science lab program with the total school curriculum?

22. What kinds of diagnostic and prescriptive techniques have you used during the past school year?

23a. Have you interacted with community members as a result of involvement with this project.

23b. If yes, in what ways?

24a. Have you been involved in the planning of a 7th grade?

24b. If yes, in what ways?

Attachment E - Student Interview

STUDENTS (Upper Level)

1. Have you helped in getting the Math/Science Lab. started?

_____ yes

_____ no

If yes, what did you do? _____

_____

_____

If no, who did help? _____

_____

2. Have you used the Math/Science Lab. yourself? _____

_____

3. What kinds of math work do you do in the Math/Science Lab.?

_____

_____

4. How is it different from what you do in the classroom? _____

_____

_____

5. What kinds of science work do you do in the Math/Science Lab.?

_____

_____

_____

6. How is it different from what you do in the classroom? _____

_____

_____

7. Is there anything else that different in school this year? _____

_____

_____

_____

## XI. APPENDIX A

Excerpts from the Shepherd Newsletter, Staff Bulletins and Advisory Committee Minutes Documenting the progress of the Recycling the Community School Project.

Shepherd Newsletter - May 21, 1974:

"The Alexander Shepherd School has been notified that the ESEA Title III Advisory Council is recommending the Shepherd proposal, "Recycling the Community School - Development Through the Middle Years", for funding to the Superintendent. The Council commended the proposal writers and task group for developing the components for a very fine proposal. Funding all FY 1975 proposals is contingent upon Congressional authorization."

Shepherd Newsletter - June 6, 1974:

"TITLE III PROPOSAL MEETING - All parents and community people interested in the formation of an advisory council to this federal project are invited to meet Tuesday, June 11th in the Shepherd School Library at 7:30 p.m. Education Comm. Chairman and Principal."

Shepherd Newsletter - June 11, 1974:

"TITLE III PROPOSAL MEETING - All parents and community people interested in the formation of an advisory council to this federal project are invited to meet Tuesday, June 11 in the Shepherd School Library at 7:30 p.m."

Shepherd Staff Bulletin - November 4-8, 1974

"Second team supervision session with Pete Mattialiano will run all day Friday, November 8. Teachers on the team will have substitute coverage (already provided)."

"Travel Bug hits Shepherd! Mathilde is in Minnesota-Dsylexia Conference Margaret Taylor leave today for Cincinnati-Science/Math Conference."

Sherpher Newsletter - December 17, 1974

"Title III coordinator's position was placed on the City Council Agenda Tuesday."

"The Math/Science Lab has a new look. Paint laboriously done with love by the Title III staff. Help needed from parents and community to organize and make materials."

"String-art is being designed for Christman gifts in the Math/Science Lab."

Shepherd School Bullentin - January 20, 1975

"The first meeting of the Title III Advisory Committee will be held this Tuesday, January 21st at 8:00 p.m."

Minutes from the First Meeting of the Title III, ESEA Sterring Committee January 21, 1975.

Shepherd School Bullentin - January 27, 1975

Title II Advisory Committee Meeting - January 21, 1975.

Shepherd School Newsletter - February 26, 1975

"TITLE III ADVISORY COMMITTEE - The Title III Advisory Committee met on February 18. We discussed the qualities we want in the Program Coordinator and also the direction of the Committee."

Shepherd School Newsletter - March 12, 1975

"Title III Project - Thus far, two meetings have been held by the Title III Parent Advisory Committee. A third meeting was scheduled for Monday, March 10th. Three representatives from the Committee participated in the screening of candidate s for the position of Project Coordinator. A candidate was selected by the screening committee (parents had one vote out of 12 applicants. Because the successful candidate is already employed by the D.C. Public School, another delay may result. The position which he/she is leaving cannot be filled due to the general "freeze". Therefore until the candidate's present position is filled, or taken care of, he/she cannot assume the position at Shepherd."

"The twofold purpose of the Title III Project remains; the revision of the existing curriculum with increased emphasis on science and math; and on analysis of the pre K - 6 program with a view toward possible extension of a 7th and 8th grade level at Shepherd."

Shepherd School - Bullentin March 12, 1975

"The TITLE III Coordinator has been appointed after much delay. Mr. Joseph Carter will report to the project during the week of March 17th."

Shepherd School Newsletter - March 27, 1975

"Title III Advisory Committee - The Title III Advisory Committee met on March 10. After the report from the participants on the Project Coordinator Selection Committee reported, it was able to tell us that the coordinator . . . should be able to report to Shepherd during the week of March 17. . . . has a Masters in Science, has been involved in the Urban League Street Academy, and is coming from a teaching position in the District School. We are hoping . . . will be able ti meet with us at our next meeting."

"The position of Community Coordinator will be advertised some time soon. This is a part-time job and it is hoped that applicants will come from Shepherd Park."

"Due to delays in getting a Project Coordinator and a Community Coordinator and thus delays in implementing the Title III proposal, it is unlikely that a 7th grade for September 1975 can come out of this proposal. We will be seeking an extension of the proposal to June, 1976, so a 7th grade in September 1976 is still a possibility. However, we do not feel that this eliminated the possibility of the community coming up with another means of providing a 7th grade in 1975 for Shepherd students outside of Title III. It is unlikely that the facilities are available at Shepherd School. The community can discuss other possibilities. We feel that this would not jeopardize the Title III prject or interfere with it."

"Next meeting is on Monday, April 7, 1975."

Shepherd School - Title III Advisory Committee - Minutes of Meeting - Monday, April 7, 1975.

Shepherd School Newsletter - April 29, 1975

"TITLE III Advisory Committee - The Title III Advisory Committee met April 7th. This was our first opportunity to meet the Title III Project Coordinator, . . . . . The bulk of the meering consisted of a discussion of the expectations of . . . and the Committee and the role the Committee will play in the implementation of the grant. We look forward to a good working relationship with . . . and are glad to have him here. . . . Amy Billingsley announced that sheis unable to continue as temporary chairperson and . . . was elected chairperson. It was noted that several members of the committee never attended a meeting or have attended very few. It is hoped that they will start coming."

"The next meeting will be May 5, 1975, 8:00 p.m."

Shepherd School - Title III Advisory Committee - Minutes of Meeting - Tuesday, May 5, 1975.

Shepherd School Bullentin - November 7, 1974

"Bus trip to University of Massachusetts in Amherst for parents and teachers, Bus to leave from Carter Baron fringe parking lot on Sixteenth Street, 5-5:30 p.m. on Wednesday, November 13. Bus to return to D.C. late Thursday, November 14. Per diem expenses wil be paid."

"All of the mini-course offerings on Thursday will have "Alternative Education" as the major focus."

Shepherd School Staff Bullentin - January 22, 1975

"Tuesday, January 21 - Title III Advisory Council Meeting - 8:00 p.m."

" Title III Advisory Council Meeting Agenda. (1) Selection of member(s) to serve on Selection Panel which will interview prospective candidates for Title III Coordinator position, (2) Review of project for advisory members.""Note: Faculty will select two permanent members to serve on the council at our next faculty meeting."

"Title III position is out on Vacancy Announcement 75-82. All persons interested should not. Position will likely be extended beyond August 31, 1975 to date (no longer than 90 days beyond)."

"The Math/Science Lab has a tentative schedule. See Staff members for more details."

Shepherd School Staff Bullentin - February 26, 1975

"Candidates for the Title III coordinator's position will be interviewed at Slowe School. The panel will consist of . . . or designee, . . . , Federal Program, the Principal and a parent from the advisory Group. Personnel sees the process of interviewing and selection as being completed by Friday. Appointment to be made immediately. Any particular questions or viewpoints you would like to have answered or stated, please give to me today. (Wednesday).

Shepherd School Staff Bullentin - March 24, 1975

"Fort Lincoln Math planning group to meet at Shepherd in Math/Science Lab on Wednesday all day. Classes to be scheduled as usual."

Shepherd School Staff Bullentin - May 6, 1975

"Monday May 5, 1975 - Title III Evaluation Team in building"

"Title III Advisory Council - 7:30 p.m."

"Tuesday, May 6, 1975 - . . . and . . . to Learning Centers Workshops in McLean, Va."

"Wednesday - May 7, 1975 - Title III Evaluation Team"

Appendix B

List of Staff Development Workshops

(1) August 29, 1974
"Metrication--Practical Applications" Shirley Craig - Mathematics Specialist/Supervisor

Experiencing the metric system in practical, functional ways to gain ideas for transfer into the Kgn.-6 instructional program.

(2) August 30, 1974 (A.M.)
"Humanistic Workshop"--Dorothy Christian - Title I Educational Specialist

Sessions included the idea of "self"...self-expectations vs. group expectations, giving and receiving positive strokes and the development of self concepts.

The purpose of this was to enable teachers to see themselves in a more humanistic way--so that this would filter into the interpersonal relationships within classrooms. It was hoped that children would be benefited directly through changed attitudes towards teaching, and, ultimately, positively changed teaching behavior.

(3) August 30, 1974 (P.M.)
"Batteries and Bulbs"--Douglas Lapp--Science Specialist Fairfax County Schools

E.S.S. unit used to demonstrate non textbook and non pencil and paper oriented approaches to science teaching, with transfer links for other curriculum areas.

(4) October 11, 1974)
November 8, 1974) Two Sessions--(A.M. and P.M.)
"Clinical Supervision"--A. Peter Mattaliano--Author and West Hartford, Conn. Educator

Intense work with staff as a team model for promoting peer supervision, which seeks to set out patterns for the teacher to analyze, and with which to grow. Purpose of this process is quickly and clearly seen to be non-threatening, and anxiety relieving.

(5) November 15, 1974
Staff Development Day--Shepherd School
"Recycling the Community School--Title III at Shepherd School."
In depth, page by page, study of the Title III proposal--to answer any questions by staff about Title III, in order to orientate staff as to the objectives and role of the Title III Project, its relationship to the total school program, and its implication for total school involvement and impact.

(6) November 26, 1974 (A.M.)
November 27, 1974
"Implementing the Science Curriculum in the Classroom."
Planning instructional strategies by grade level for implementing and augmenting the D. C. Public School Science Curriculum.

(7) Wednesdays (A.M.)--10 weeks beginning October 3, 1974
"Experimental In School Math Instructional Team Workshop."
Advisory and Learning Exchange--Genny Peterson
Three teachers on successive grade levels were involved in a workshop designed to promote approaches to activity oriented learning and individualization in Math. Manipulative materials were made to develop concepts in problem solving related to base 10 and other number bases; computation skills, whole numbers and fractions; geometry and measurement. The Advisory and Learning Exchange, as a part of their innovative design, has provided effective followup by working with children in the classrooms of the teachers involved to support the multiage, interdisciplinary concept of mathematics teaching. As a long-range goal of this training experience, the three teachers initially involved have agreed to share learnings with other teachers in staff development sessions with support from the Advisory.

(8) November 13-14, 1974
University of Massachusetts--Amherst, Mass.
School of Education--"Fall Marathon."
Eighteen teachers and twenty parents and community people were involved in a variety of seminars and workshops offered by the resident faculty and visiting instructors at the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. The offerings represented the most current and innovative thinking in the field of education. This excursion is viewed by Title III as a particularly valuable experience... not only were the class sessions outstanding, but the parental involvement led to the kinds of positive interactions between parents and teachers that gives viability to the school program.

(9) May 20, 1975
Shepherd School
"What is Open Education?"

Definition, Purpose and Components of: learning stations, boxed station, task cards, task folders

Display and Demonstration of learning stations, boxed stations, task cards and task folder.

Creating individualized materials.

## Appendix C

## Examples of Math/Science Lab Record Keeping

### LOGIC CENTER RECORD

Name _____ Grade Code _____

| Date | Games/Activity | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

### MATH MASTERY RECORD

Name _____ Grade Code _____

| Date | Math Set | Number in Set | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mastered | Studying |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

### DIGITOR RECORD

Name _____ Grade Code _____

| Date | Level | Operator | Number of Problems | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Right | In All |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Appendix D

SCIENCE ATTITUDE QUESTIONNAIRE

How much did you enjoy science this year?

Very much  Some  Not at all

How many of your friends like science?

Most of them  A few of them  Almost none of them

Which of these school subjects do you like best? Pick three.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Reading | Math | Physical Ed |
| Science | Music | Social Studies |

Pick three things from this list that you think are most important to learn about.

| | |
|---|---|
| Space travel | How to record population data |
| Weather forecasting | How to classify animals |
| Effects of drugs | How to plan an experiment |
| Measuring in the metric system | How to take care of our environment |
| How to make an hypothesis | |

Put a check mark in front of the things you are sure you can do.

Tell what is in the solar system
Measure the length of a book in centimeters
Draw a graph of the daily temperatures for a week
Tell why we should protect our air and water
Plan an experiment and carry it out
Draw a diagram of an electric circuit
List five vertebrate animals and five invertebrate animals
Tell the funtion of the heart, lungs, stomach, and intestines in your body
Describe the population in an aquarium and tell how the living things depend on each other

Do you think that our country needs to have more scientists to do scientific work for the government?

Yes  No

Table I Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Interviewees Endorsing Factors as Stimuli for Proposal Writing



| Question 1 (Face to Face Interview) | PARENTS (n=5) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL (n=7) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Participants | % of Participants | # of Participants | % of Participants |
| Desire for a 7th grade | 5 | 100.0 | 5 | 71.5 |
| Need for a community school | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other Need for change | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for improvement in math/science skills | 1 | 20.0 | 4 | 57.2 |
| Do not have first hand knowledge of the program | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |

Table II. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Project Objectives Considered by Interviewwes to be Achievements of the Project.

| Question 6<br>Face to Face Interview | PARENTS (n=5) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL (n=7) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| Increase in math/science Skills | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Individualization of Total School Curriculum | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Development of Community Middle School | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Development of K-7 Curriculum | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Work Toward Increased Liaison with Community | 1 | 20.0 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Increase in Staff Development | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 57.2 |
| Implementation of math/science Program | 2 | 40.0 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Set up of math/science lab | 1 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not think that much has been accomplished | 1 | 20.0 | 1 | 14.3 |
| Progress made Toward Individualization of the Total School Curriculum | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Do Not Know | 2 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

TABLE III

Date of Initiation of Involvement in the "Recycling the Community School" Project and Number of Months of Involvement of Each of the Participants Who Responded to the Paper and Pencil Questionnaire

| Participant # | Date of Initiation of Involvement | Number of Months as Participant |
|---|---|---|
| Parents | | |
| 1 | 1-75 | 6 |
| 2 | 11-73 | 20 |
| 3 | 10-73 | 21 |
| 4 | 1-75 | 6 |
| 5 | 9-74 | 10 |
| 6 | 2-75 | 5 |
| 7 | 4-74 | 15 |
| 8 | 10-73 | 21 |
| 9 | 6-74 | 13 |
| 10 | 9-74 | 10 |
| 11 | 6-74 | 13 |
| 12 | 1-74 | 18 |
| School Personnel | | |
| 15 | 10-74 | 9 |
| 16 | 4-74 | 15 |
| 17 | 10-74 | 9 |
| 18 | 3-75 | 4 |
| 19 | N/R* | N/R |
| 20 | 3-72 | 38 |
| 21 | 10-74 | 9 |
| 22 | 9-74 | 10 |
| 23 | 9-74 | 10 |
| 24 | 4-74 | 15 |

* the participant did not respond to the question

67.

Table IV. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Parent Participants* Endorsing Events as being of First, Second, and Third in Importance in Stimulating the Writing of the Proposal for the "Recycling the Community School" Program.

| Question 8 (paper and pencil questionnaire) Alternatives considered as stimuli for Writing of the Proposal | Considered by participants be the primary stimulus (n=12) | | Considered by participants be the second in importance | | Considered by participants to be third in importance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| (21) Desire for development of 7th grade | 8 | 66.6 | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (22) Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 24.9 | 1 | 8.3 |
| (23) Need for improvement in math/science skills | 1 | 8.3 | 6 | 49.8 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (24) Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 33.2 |
| (25) Need for increased staff development | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 8.3 | 4 | 33.2 |
| (26) Other | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 8.3 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 16.6 |

* These parents were slected from among members of the Title III Citizens Advisory Council. As such, they represent a group of parents who have been activily involved in the project.

Table V. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of School Personnel Participants Endorsing Events as being of First, Second, and Third in Importance in Stimulating the Writing of the Proposal for the "Recycling the Community School" Project.

| Question 8 (paper and pencil questionnaire) Alternatives considered as stimuli for Writing of the Proposal | Considered by participants the primary stimulus (N=10) | | Considered by participants the second in importance | | Considered by participants third in importance | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Partic-ipants Endorsing |
| (21) Desire for development of 7th grade | 8 | 80 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (22) Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 30 | 4 | 40 |
| (23) Need for improvement in math/science skills | 2 | 20 | 4 | 40 | 1 | 10 |
| (24) Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 30 |
| (25) Need for increased staff development | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 10 |
| (26) Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 10 |

Table VI Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Program Objectives as Being Closest to Realization

| Question 9 (paper and pencil questionnaire) | PARENTS (N=12) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL (N=10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| (21) Feasibility study for development of 7th grade | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (22) Development of an overall individualized instructional program | 2 | 16.7 | 2 | 20.0 |
| (23) Improvement in math/science skills | 6 | 50.0 | 7 | 70.0 |
| (24) Increased Communication between School and Community | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (25) Increased staff development | 2 | 16.7 | 1 | 10.0 |
| (26) Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table VII Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Program Objectives as being Second Closest to Realization

| Question 10 (paper and pencil questionnaire) Program Objectives as being Second Closest to Realization | PARENTS (n=12) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL (n=10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| (21) Feasibility study for development of 7th grade | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (22) Development of overall individualized instructional program | 0 | 0.0 | 4 | 40.0 |
| (23) Improvement of Math/Science skills | 1 | 8.3 | 2 | 20.0 |
| (24) Development of increased communication between school and community | 2 | 16.7 | 2 | 20.0 |
| (25) Increased staff development | 5 | 41.5 | 2 | 20.0 |
| (26) Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No objective | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table VIII. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Program Aspects as Being Achievements of the Project to Date.

| Question 14 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire<br>Items Considered to be Achievements of the Project | Parents (N=12) | | School Personnel (N=10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants |
| Setting up the Math/Science lab | 1 | 8.3 | 7 | 70.0 |
| Individualization of instructional program | 3 | 25.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| Staff development | 3 | 25.0 | 2 | 20.0 |
| Community participation | 3 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Feasibility Study for 7th grade | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Securing of funds | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Hiring of the Program Coordinator | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| Very little | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 30.0 |

Table IX. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Parent Participants (N=10) Rating Specific Program Aspects as to the Degree of Importance, Amount of Work Done and Degree of Satisfaction with Work Done

| Program Aspects Question 13. (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) | | Degree of Importance | | | | Amount of Work Done | | | | | Degree of Satisfaction With Work Done | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | HIGH | MIDDLE | LOW | N/R | MUCH | SOME | LITTLE | NONE | N/R | HIGH | MIDDLE | LOW | N/R |
| Increase in Math/Science skills through use of the Math/Science Lab. | # of endorsements | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| | % of participants | 33.2 | 41.5 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 16.6 | 58.1 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 24.9 | 41.5 | 24.9 | 8.3 |
| Individualization of instruction through use of Math/Science Lab | # of endorsements | 4 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 2 |
| | % of participants | 33.2 | 49.8 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 41.5 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 16.6 | 24.9 | 41.5 | 16.6 |
| Feasibility study for the establishment of the 7th grade | # of endorsements | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 2 |
| | % of participants | 66.4 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 8.3 | 33.2 | 41.5 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 66.4 | 16.6 |
| Community involvement, through the development of a Title III Advisory Council for community input | # of endorsements | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 |
| | % of participants | 66.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 49.8 | 8.3 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 16.6 | 41.5 | 16.6 | 24.9 |
| Staff development (in areas of math, science, and human relation) | # of endorsements | 8 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| | % of participants | 66.4 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 41.5 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 33.2 | 0.0 | 24.9 | 41.5 | 33.2 |
| Increased communication between school and community | # of endorsements | 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 3 |
| | % of participants | 41.5 | 33.2 | 8.3 | 16.6 | 0.0 | 49.8 | 16.6 | 8.3 | 24.9 | 0.0 | 41.5 | 33. | 24.9 |

Table X. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of School Personnel (n=10) Participants Rating Specific Program Aspects as to the Degree of Importance, Amount of Work Done and Degree of Satisfaction.

| Program Aspects Question 13. (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) | | Degree of Importance | | | | Amount of Work Done | | | | | Degree of Satisfaction With Work Done | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | HIGH | MIDDLE | LOW | N/R | MUCH | SOME | LITTLE | NONE | N/R | HIGH | MIDDLE | LOW | N/R |
| Increase in Math/Science skills through use of the Math/Science Lab. | # of endorsements | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 |
| | % of participants | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Individualization of instruction through use of Math/Science Lab | # of endorsements | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 |
| | % of participants | 100.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 60.0 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 |
| Feasibility study for the establishment of the 7th grade | # of endorsements | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 |
| | % of participants | 30.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 50.0 | 50.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 |
| Community involvement, through the development of a Title III Advisory Council for community input | # of endorsements | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 2 |
| | % of participants | 30.0 | 40.0 | 10.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 60.0 | 20.0 | 20.0 |
| Staff development (in areas of math, science, and human relation) | # of endorsements | 7 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 0 |
| | % of participants | 70.0 | 20.0 | 10.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 80.0 | 20.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 50.0 | 40.0 | 0.0 |
| Increased communication between school and community | # of endorsements | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 |
| | % of participants | 40.0 | 60.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 10.0 | 60.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 20.0 | 50.0 | 30.0 | 0.0 |

Table XI. Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Events, Circumstances, or People Who Have Facilitated Impementation of This Program

| Question 11 (paper and pencil questionnaire)<br><br>Events, Circumstances, or People Who Have Facilitated Implementation of this Program | PARENTS (N=12) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL N=10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| (29) Participation of community members and groups | 9 | 75.0 | 5 | 50.0 |
| (30) Timing in hiring the program coordinator | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 10.0 |
| (31) Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator | 3 | 25.0 | 4 | 40.0 |
| (32) Amount of communication between school personnel and community members | 1 | 8.3 | 4 | 40.0 |
| (33) Timing in hiring a community resource coordinator | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (34) Amount of agreement about program objectives | 3 | 25.0 | 4 | 40.0 |
| (35) Participation of the Shepherd administration | 4 | 33.3 | 8 | 80.0 |
| (36) Participation of the Shepherd Faculty | 1 | 8.3 | 1 | 10.0 |
| (37) Other | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| None | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No Response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XII Number of Endorsements and Percentage of Participants Endorsing Events, Circumstances, or People Who have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program.

| Question 12 (paper and pencil questionnaire)<br><br>Events, Circumstances, or People Who have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program | PARENTS (n = 12) | | SCHOOL PERSONNEL (n = 10) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | Participants Endorsing |
| (38) Participation of community members and groups | 0 | 0.0 | 3 | 30.0 |
| (39) Timing in hiring program coordinator | 11 | 91.7 | 9 | 90.0 |
| (40) Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator) | 8 | 66.7 | 4 | 40.0 |
| (41) Amount of communication between school personnel and community members | 7 | 58.3 | 1 | 10.0 |
| (42) Timing in hiring a community resource coordinator | 2 | 16.7 | 6 | 60.0 |
| (43) Amount of agreement about program objectives | 3 | 25.0 | 5 | 50.0 |
| (44) Participation of the Shepherd administration | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (45) Participation of the Shepherd faculty | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| (46) Other | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XIII Comparison of the Responses Given by Parent Participants During the May 1975 First Administration of the Questionnaire with the Responses Given During the Retest Administration and the July 1975 First Administration: Event Considered to be Primary Stimulus for Writing of the Proposal.

| Question 8 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) | First Administration (May 1975) Parents (n=12) | | Retest (July 1975) Parents (n=3) | | Second Administration (July 1975) Parents (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alternatives Considered as Primary Stimuli for Writing of the Proposal | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants |
| Desire for development of 7th grade | 8 | 66.6 | 3 | 100.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 100.0 |
| Need for improvement in math/science skills | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for increased staff development | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XIV. Comparison of the Endorsements by School Personnel Participants at the Time of the First Administration of the Questionnaire with Responses From Retest Administration: Primary Stimulus for the Writing of the Proposal

| Question 8 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) | First Administration School Personnel (n=10) | | Retest Administration School Personnel (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Alternative Considered as Primary Stimuli for the Writing of the Proposal | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| Desire for development of 7th grade | 8 | 80.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for improvement in math/science skills | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for increased staff development | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 10[illegible].00 |
| Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XV Comparison of Responses Given by School Personnel Participants at the Time of First Administration of the Questionnaire with the Responses Given During the Retest Administration: Project Objective Considered Closest to Realization

| Question 9 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) Objective Considered Closest to Realization | First Administration School Personnel (n=10) | | Retest Administration School Personnel (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | # of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| Desire for development of 7th grade | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for improvement in math/science skills | 7 | 70.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for increased staff development | 1 | 10.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| None | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Do not know | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XVI Comparison of Responses Given by Parent Participants During the May 1975 First Administration of the Questionnaire with the Responses Given During the Retest Administration and the July 1975 First Administration: Project Objective Considered Closest to Realization.

| Question 19 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire<br>Objective Considered Closest to Realization | First Administration (May 1975) Parents (n=2) | | Retest Administration (July 1975) Parents (n=3) | | Second Administration (July 1975) Parents (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsments | % of Participant Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| Desire for development of 7th grade | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for an overall individualized instructional program | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for improvement in math/science skills | 6 | 50.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Desire for development of increased communication between school and community | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Need for increased staff development | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Other | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| None | | | 2 | 56.7 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Do not know | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No Response | | | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XVII Comparison of Responses Given by Parent Participants During the May 1975 First Administration of the Questionnaire with the Responses Given During the Retest Administration and the July 1975 First Administration: Events that have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program.

| Question 12 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) Events, Circumstances, or People Who Have Presented Difficulties in Implementing this Program | First Administration (May 1975) Parents (n=12) | | Retest Administration (July 1975) Parents (n=3) | | Second Administration (July 1975) Parents (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants Endorsing |
| Participation of community members and groups | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Timing in hiring the program coordinator | 11 | 91.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator | 8 | 66.7 | 2 | 66.7 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Amount of communication between school personnel and community members | 7 | 58.3 | 2 | 66.7 | 1 | 50.0 |
| Timing in hiring a community resource coordinator | 2 | 16.7 | 1 | 33.3 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Amount of agreement about programs objectives | 3 | 25.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Participation of the Shepherd Administration | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Participation of the Shepherd Faculty | 1 | 8.3 | 0 | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 |
| Other | 2 | 16.7 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XVIII Comparison of Responses Given by School Personnel Participants at the Time of the First Administration of the Questionnaire with the Responses Given During the Retest Administration: Events, Circumstances, on People Who Have Presented Difficulties in Implementing The Program.

| Question 12 (Paper and Pencil Questionnaire) Events, Circumstances on People Who Have Presented Difficulties in Implementing This Program | First Administration School Personnel (n=10) | | Retest Administration School Personnel (n=2) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants | Number of Endorsements | % of Participants |
| Participation of community members and groups | 3 | 30.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Timing in hiring the program coordinator | 9 | 90.0 | 12 | 100.0 |
| Sequencing of hiring of Title III personnel (e.g., math/science teachers, program coordinator, community resource coordinator) | 4 | 40.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Amount of communication between school personnel and community members | 2 | 20.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Timing in hiring a community resourse coordinator | 6 | 60.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Amount of agreement about program objectives | 6 | 60.0 | 2 | 100.0 |
| Participation of the Shepherd administration | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Participation of the Shepherd faculty | 1 | 10.0 | 0 | 0.0 |
| No response | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 |

Table XIX

Prescriptive Math Test
1974-75 School Year - Summary of Group Percent Mastery
Grade I

| Item | Fall 1974 % Pass | Spring 1975 % Pass | D | $D^2$ | Sign |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .74 | .88 | .14 | .0196 | + |
| 2 | .62 | 1.00 | .38 | .1444 | + |
| 3 | .06 | .57 | .51 | .2601 | + |
| 4 | .21 | .62 | .41 | .1681 | + |
| 5 | .40 | .90 | .50 | .2500 | + |
| 6 | .49 | .80 | .31 | .0961 | + |
| 7 | .74 | .92 | .18 | .0324 | + |
| 8 | .51 | .78 | .27 | .0729 | + |
| 9 | .66 | .83 | .17 | .0289 | + |
| 10 | .68 | .95 | .27 | .0729 | + |
| 11 | .36 | .87 | .51 | .2601 | + |
| 12 | .09 | .43 | .34 | .1156 | + |
| 13 | 0.00 | .17 | .17 | .0289 | + |
| 14 | .40 | .88 | .48 | .2304 | + |
| 15 | .32 | .82 | .50 | .2500 | + |
| 16 | .87 | .95 | .08 | .0064 | + |
| 17 | .45 | .90 | .45 | .2025 | + |
| 18 | .79 | .92 | .13 | .0169 | + |
| 19 | .19 | .57 | .38 | .1444 | + |
| 20 | .08 | .67 | .59 | .3481 | + |
| 21 | .36 | .77 | .41 | .1681 | + |
| 22 | .21 | .77 | .56 | .3136 | + |
| 23 | .23 | .80 | .57 | .3249 | + |
| 24 | .06 | .82 | .76 | .5776 | + |
| 25 | .47 | .77 | .30 | .0900 | + |
| 26 | .62 | .88 | .26 | .0676 | + |
| 27 | .09 | .73 | .64 | .4096 | + |
| 28 | .28 | .82 | .54 | .2916 | + |
| 29 | .06 | .68 | .62 | .3844 | + |
| 30 | 0.00 | .13 | .13 | .0169 | + |
| 31 | .15 | .68 | .53 | .2809 | + |
| 32 | .08 | .47 | .39 | .1521 | + |
| 33 | .02 | .33 | .31 | .0961 | + |
| 34 | .55 | .85 | .30 | .09 | + |
| 35 | .02 | .60 | .58 | .3364 | + |
| 36 | .08 | .70 | .62 | .3844 | + |
| 37 | .64 | .88 | .24 | .0576 | + |
| 38 | .26 | .67 | .41 | .1681 | + |
| 39 | .23 | .42 | .19 | .0361 | + |
| 40 | .87 | 1.00 | .13 | .0169 | + |
| 41 | .64 | .72 | .08 | .0064 | + |
| 42 | .79 | .97 | .18 | .0324 | + |
| 43 | .92 | 1.00 | .08 | .0064 | + |
| 44 | .58 | .67 | .09 | .0081 | + |
| 45 | .19 | .50 | .31 | .0961 | + |
| | E=17.06 | E=30.36 | ED=16.3 | $D^2$=7.16 | |
| | X=.379 | $\bar{X}$=.6747 | $\bar{X}$ of D .36 | $\bar{X}$ of $D^2$ = .1591 | |

Table XX . Summary Data for Prescriptive Math Test Administered to Shepherd Students During 1974-75 School Year



| | Fall 1974 Administration Mean Percent Mastery | Spring 1975 Administration Mean Percent Mastery | Mean of Differences Between Fall & Spring Administration | Significance of Difference |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade 1 | .38 | .67 | .36 | $p < .001$ |
| Grade 2 | * | .65 | * | * |
| Grade 3 | .43 | .61 | .18 | $p < .001$ |
| Grade 4 | .42 | .65 | .14 | $p < .001$ |
| Grade 5 | .11 | .23 | .05 | $p < .001$ |
| Grade 6 | * | * | * | * |



* The data for Grade 2 from the Fall 1974 administration of the PMT were not available to the evaluators. Therefore, no differences could be calculated since we did not have complete summary data for this group of students. The data for Grade 6 from the Fall 1974 and Spring 1975 administrations were also not available to the evaluators.

Table XXI Comparison of Parent and School Personnel Views of What Facilitated or Interfered with Implementation of the Program.

| Events or Circumstances That Have Facilitated or Interfered | Parent | | School Personnel | | Agree |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | + | - | + | - | |
| Participation of Community | 75 | 0 | 50 | 30 | No |
| Timing of Hiring Program Coordinator | 0 | 91.7 | 10 | 90 | Yes |
| Sequencing of hiring Title III Personnel | 25 | 66.7 | 40 | 40 | No |
| Amount of Communication between school and community | 8.3 | 58.3 | 40 | 10 | No |
| Timing in hiring Community Resource Coordinator | 0 | 16.7 | 0 | 60 | No |
| Amount of agreement about program objectives | 25 | 25.0 | 40 | 50 | Yes |
| Participation of Administration | 33.3 | 16.7 | 80 | 0 | No |
| Participation of Faculty | 8.3 | 8.3 | 10 | 0 | Yes |
| Other | 16.7 | 16.7 | 0 | 0 | No |
| None | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |
| Do not know | 8.3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | No |
| No Response | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Yes |